



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

HINTS

TO

COUNTRY BUMPKINS

BY

A COUNTRY BUMPKIN.

'He lies like a demagogue.'—*Proverbial Saying.*

'These Radicals tell you that they will better your lot. Let them say how they will do it! They want to upset everything. They churn the milk to get the cream for themselves, and leave you the skim. You live by wages. If they had their way, you would have no work and no wages. Do you suppose that if the squire and the parson and the farmer were ruined, you would gain? These Radicals are self-seeking humbugs.'—*A London Newspaper.*

LONDON:
HATCHARDS, PICCADILLY.

1885.

2288. e. 81.



CONTENTS.

| | PAGE |
|----------------------------------|------|
| OUR FRENCH POLITICIANS | 23 |
| GAME LAWS | 84 |
| OUR COLONIES | 88 |
| TAXATION | 90 |
| MEDDLE AND MUDDLE | 91 |
| FREE TRADE | 104 |

HINTS

TO

COUNTRY BUMPKINS.

THE time is near when you will vote for a Member of Parliament. Which will you vote for—the Conservative or the Liberal? First, what is a Conservative and what is a Liberal?

‘A Conservative’ at the present day is a man who hates meddling with individual liberty, and wishes to preserve what is good and reform gradually what is bad. All sudden changes cause misery in proportion as they are great and sudden.

‘A Liberal’ used to mean a man who was in favour of reforming what wanted reforming. At the present time it means a Radical, a Socialist, and a Revolutionist. In revolutions all men suffer, but the wage-earners die of starvation. They get no wages.

A great country is a tree that has gradually grown to what it is; its branches (institutions) existing because they, by surviving, have proved themselves to be the fittest to survive under the circumstances. A wise gardener prunes the branches of a tree as they require it. A radical fool of a gardener tears the tree up by the roots, and leaves it to rot on the ground.

Till five years ago a Liberal meant a man who loves liberty, even though he knows that where there is liberty there cannot be equality. The only way to ensure all people being equal, and each possessing only one pig, is by making tyrannical laws to destroy his *liberty* to become the owner of two pigs.

Now, this liberty the Liberal of the present day wishes to destroy in order to get equality. He wants to return to the condition of Digger Indians, who are all equal, and who live by grubbing in the ground for roots, or like Andaman Indians who live by eating mud : equality is only found amongst such people as these. The Liberal now is a traitor to liberty. He is a renegade. He has gone over to the enemy. In fact he has become a French Socialist who wishes to destroy everything that is.

The Conservative wishes to preserve everything that is good, to reform everything that is bad, and to meddle as little as possible with individual liberty.

The Liberal has become an illiberal despotic tyrant, who wants to drill everybody into being machines, and prevent them from thinking a thought or doing a thing for themselves. French Socialists, and indeed all Socialists, love equality, and therefore hate liberty, because they are vain, envious people who cannot bear to see any one richer than themselves. A Frenchman cannot bear to see another man with two pigs when he has only one. Englishmen, on the contrary, have hitherto loved liberty, and thus England is what she is.

Therefore your election cry ought to be, 'Liberty

for ever, and down with Socialism!' Socialism means tyrannical meddling. A Liberal, a Radical, a Socialist, and a French Jacobin, mean the same. You will know them by the lies they tell you. 'To lie like a demagogue' is a very old saying.

At an election Radicals pour promises into your ears as easily as an Irishman pours whisky down his throat. They find no difficulty in the thing whatever, and there seems to be no limit to the quantity. But though the Radicals laugh at you as a stupid country bumpkin, and therefore easy to be duped, I myself suspect that you are a little bit sharper than they think.

Sir Stafford Northcote, talking of the Radical lies, says that the Liberal party carry on their political warfare by spreading lies over the country—not petty lies, but 'real big thumpers.'

I am sadly afraid that in the heat of political discussion neither party is perfectly scrupulous in what they say. The difference is this: Whilst the Conservative is not always quite scrupulous, the Liberal or Radical is generally quite unscrupulous, unceasingly flooding the country with what, as I have already said, Sir Stafford Northcote calls 'real big thumping lies;' that means lies so palpable and so substantial that a man could break his head against them.

I think there cannot be a better name for all these inventions than 'the Radical Thumpers.' Here is an instance of a 'Radical Thumper.' I only give it instead of some other because I saw it in the last

newspaper I read. One has only to look in any paper about election time to find half-a-dozen :—

‘MR. ROWLAND WINN AND DISSENTERS.

‘SIR,—

‘A prominent Radical of this town has recently been addressing Radical meetings in North Lincolnshire, and since his return to Hull has made statements that the late Member for North Lincolnshire was a bitter opponent of Dissenters, and would not let, or lease, or sell land to Dissenters on which to build places of worship.

‘Knowing that such bigotry is alien to the spirit and genius of Conservatism, I communicated with Mr. Rowland Winn, and shall feel obliged by your publishing his reply, which I enclose herewith.

‘Yours respectfully,

‘J. ALCOCK.

3 Rosamund Street, Hull.

Here is Mr. Winn’s answer :—

‘11 GROSVENOR GARDENS,
‘*July 3rd, 1885.*

‘SIR,—

‘I do not know that I can answer your letter better than by telling you that about a couple of months ago I leased a piece of land (on a long lease) at a nominal rent at Frodingham, for the purpose of building a Dissenting chapel, and I rather think they have already commenced it.

‘I am,

‘Yours faithfully,

‘ROW. WINN.’

Now for another 'Radical Thumper': The British public were solemnly informed not long ago, by even one of the more respectable Radical societies, that the House of Lords had imposed millions upon millions of unjust taxes upon the people. Of course the House of Lords never did anything of the kind, inasmuch as the House of Lords has not power to impose a penny of taxation on anybody. It is the House of Commons that imposes taxes. It is a mistake to take no notice of lies. They should always be contradicted, for they do enormous harm, up to ruining nations. Active lies beat lazy truth all the world over. I do not mean that all Radical lies should be contradicted in print, for this would fill the world with books, so that there would be no room for any others. Still the truth should be told 'in season and out of season.' No doubt, supposing activity in telling them the same, truth will in the end beat lies. But the activity is not the same. 'A lie has no legs,' says the proverb, but in these days we find that it has a great many legs, and sometimes stands uncommonly firm on them. Some absolutely honest people *cannot* believe in lies getting the better of truth. Sir Stafford Northcote thinks that truth must prevail in the end. But it all depends on the way a nation is going. If down-hill, lies prevail. Going down-hill means, in fact, lies prevailing. If a minority of liars lie energetically and a majority of truth-tellers tell the truth lazily, the lies will prevail. I will give you one or two more instances of 'Radical Thumpers.'

Inferior lands in all countries sometimes lie waste for a time. They want a great deal of money to put them into a state of cultivation. If they were all made into farms there would be so much more work for you to do. But the Liberals or Socialists are always doing their best to ruin landowners, so that they are afraid to risk their money in turning them into farms. These Socialists, or Liberals, sometimes tell you that if the owners will not work this inferior land it will be handed over to you on easy terms. But, in the first place, this is only a 'Radical Thumper' to dupe you into voting for them ; in the second place, being inferior land, working it without capital would ruin you ; and, in the third place, one of the shining lights of Socialism or Radicalism is Mr. Henry George, who goes about the country preaching the gospel of theft, and telling the public that every owner of land, whether of one acre, ten acres, one hundred acres, one thousand or ten thousand acres, is a 'land-grabber,' and that his land must be taken from him without compensation ; or, to use ordinary language, stolen from him.

A few years ago an official inquiry took place in France upon the state of agriculture in that country of peasant proprietors and division of property, and some curious statements resulted from it. Poor men were described as flocking to the towns in consequence of the dearth of capital in the country, which dearth was stated to be produced by the extreme division of property ; and this system of innumerable small peasant properties was called the

great impediment to improvements, such as draining, machinery, &c., inasmuch as small peasant land-owners cannot afford these things.

Now our Liberals and Socialists all tell you that the reason labourers flock to towns in England is because England is *not* cut up into very small peasant properties. Is it possible that this is only another instance of a 'Radical Thumper'? It really almost looks like it.

One desire of all sensible landowners in England just now is to provide a number of very small farms for those working men who have saved enough money to take them. But this, as I have said, costs much money in building the necessary buildings. Now the Town Radicals, from their town hatred of the agricultural interest, try to impoverish land-owners, and have already made laws that have destroyed confidence. If they get into power, they will make more such laws. Thus landowners are afraid of venturing their money in providing small farms, for fear of this destructive legislation. If Conservatives get into power, confidence will be restored, and then there will gradually grow up in the country numerous farms and allotments small enough to give industrious and careful men an object for saving.

To buy a small farm in an old country like England (where land is dear, and the soil is not fresh soil, like the soil in a new country) will be very apt to ruin a working man, and put him in the hands of Jews and money-lenders, as it does in France. But many a man will be able to save enough to hire

a small farm. For England to go back to the old system of peasants owning instead of hiring land would be like going back from railroads to the old stage-coaches. It would be like returning to the old spinning-wheels. It would be like a man running a race backwards against another man running forwards. Of course, he would be beaten.

The old peasant ownership has nearly died out in England because it did not pay. It was, exceptions apart, found to be the ruin of those who tried it.

I know a landowner who wanted to spend money in making buildings for small holdings. But then came Mr. Gladstone's Legislation in Ireland, confiscating property and legalising the violation of honesty with regard to contracts and solemn engagements. At once his plans were stopped, confidence in the security of any improvements and expenditure of the kind being destroyed. Of course, this is only one instance out of innumerable ones. Confidence in business is a very sensitive thing ; the least thing makes it go up and down like a balloon. A balloon is stationary. A very small quantity of gas is let out, and down the balloon drops twenty yards. A chicken-bone is thrown out, and up jumps the balloon to where it was before.

In June, Mr. Chamberlain made some public statements about the prosperity of English trade. But in these days of keen party watchfulness it is very shortsighted to make false public statements, and, sure enough, within a week came, in the *Times*, chapter and verse proving indisputably Mr. Cham-

berlain's statements to have been false. But mind this : 'Thumping lies' are not *always* known to be lies by the teller. Party feeling or class hatred sometimes for a time completely destroys the intelligence, so that consciousness of the difference between the truth and falsehood vanishes, and then come the 'Radical Thumpers,' which, if they lead to political action, must, of course, bring disaster to the country in proportion. Right action means action founded on truth, and therefore beneficial. George Eliot says that ill-will *always* condemns a man to stupidity exactly corresponding to the degree of ill-will.

The Liberals, to get your votes, promise you all sorts of good things, and improvement in your lot all for nothing. But these, of course, are nothing but 'Radical Thumpers.' Richard Cobden said that there is no easy road to prosperity : that the only way is for a man to depend on himself and improve his own character in sobriety, temperance, and industry. And Cobden was right.

The Conservatives cannot tell you such lies, or promise you impossible things. Still, there are things they can promise you with truth. They can promise that if confidence is restored, by the Liberals, or French Revolutionary party, being shut out from power, prosperity will return, wages will increase, capital will be spent by landowners in providing those of you who want them with little farms and allotments, and landlords will have money to make improvements that may be required for your cottages and gardens. Making buildings for small holdings

cost much money ; and if Radicals and Liberals unsettle everything, and destroy confidence by eternal meddling legislation, as it is their nature as Radicals and Revolutionists to do, no sensible man will risk his money.

Again I say to you, beware of ‘ Radical Thumpers.’ ‘ Nothing,’ says the great writer, Carlyle, ‘ is so sad or does so much harm as beautiful lies beautifully told.’ And many of the Radical liars are clever men, and do tell them very beautifully ; though if you watch them closely you will generally be able to detect the tongue in the cheek. I suppose you know where most of the lies are manufactured. You have heard of the ‘ Birmingham Caucus’ ? You know, no doubt, that it is the manufactory where lies are worked up out of the raw material, and turned into the manufactured article, suitable, as they think, for duping the working man. Every large town has its special business. Manchester turns out cotton goods, Bradford turns out woollen goods, and Birmingham turns out lies and hardware. The Managers of the Lie Manufactory are supposed to be Birmingham Jews. The Jews are a sharp-witted, cunning people, and many of them are very ‘ wise in their generation,’ as the Bible puts it. You know what that means.

Liberalism of the present day means the ideas of the Jew Socialist, Karl Marx, and of our English French politicians like Sir Charles Dilke, who lives in France, and all whose ideas are French ideas. You will have to choose which you will vote for : the Conservative—that is, the Englishman who loves

liberty—or the French and Jew Socialists, who hate liberty, and who want to prevent you from ever moving a finger without first getting permission to do so from one of their meddling Inspectors and Officials.

‘The best demagogues,’ says Mr. J. W. Flanagan, ‘are enthusiasts, the worst are adventurers ; and neither have much regard for truth.’ Such is the Jacobin (French word for Radical), whatever his country. It is remarkable, says Heinrich Heine, in his ironical manner, ‘that the Jacobins, as well as the Jesuits, adopted the lie as a fair weapon of war, perhaps because both are animated with the loftiest aims ; the former in the cause of mankind, the latter in the cause of God.’

After all, lie as our Radicals may, they do the thing much better in America. A man in that country offered himself as a candidate for the Governorship of one of the States. At once the newspapers on the Radical side stated as positive facts, that he had been convicted of perjury by thirty-four witnesses at Hong Kong (he had never been out of New York State in his life), that he was once tarred and feathered, and ridden on a rail for stealing at Montana (he did not even know where Montana was), that he was lately seen reeling to bed in a state of brutal intoxication (he was a strict and consistent teetotaler), and that he had poisoned his uncle to get his property (he never had an uncle). Besides this, whenever he addressed a public meeting, eleven little children of all shades and colour, and degrees of

raggedness, and all under four years of age, were taught to rush on to the platform, clasp him round the legs, and call him ‘Papa.’ They certainly manage such things better in America than we do. Still, some of our own orators on the stump frame well, only they must not think they have nothing to learn. No progress is ever made by a man who thinks he knows everything.

There is, of course, a Radical or Revolutionary party in America just as well as in all countries.

Never you believe one word the Radical demagogue tells you. ‘The demagogue,’ says M. Taine, ‘is the parasite of democracy corresponding to the parasites of kings.’ Each flatters his master, the one the monarch, the other the ‘People.’ The demagogue tells the wage-earners that they are ‘sons of toil,’ and therefore should be discontented with their lot. But ‘toil’ means ‘work,’ and work is the happiness of life. Sir Benjamin Brodie, the great surgeon, said he considered the life of an agricultural labourer in good work the happiest in the world. Mr. Bagehot, a man with independent means, took to hard work because he thought it ‘so much more amusing a life than a life of amusement.’ H. Heine said in his humorous manner that ‘there ought to be societies to make the lot of rich men happier than they are.’ He thought that from want of work they were the most unhappy of all classes.

Mr. Holyoake, a working man, says, ‘the happiest lot on earth is that of a working man earning good wages.’

The Radicals promise you anything and everything. Nothing is easier than to make promises. They tell you that you will all be rich if only you vote for a Liberal or Radical follower of our French Socialist Statesmen (so called). But all these are nothing but 'Radical Thumpers.' I will give you one or two more of them. The Radicals said at the last election that Radicalism means economy and peace. What are the facts ? As to economy, the Radical Government has spent in one year a hundred million pounds. Mr. Gladstone's Government will be known in future as 'The Hundred Million Government.' What is that I hear some of you say ? 'That the rich pay this and you don't ?' Don't you ? Do you mean that you never smoke a pipe—that you never drink a cup of tea—that you never drink a glass of beer or gin-and-water ? Oh ! you sometimes do these things ? Then you pay by so much for this reckless extravagance. Again, you work for wages. But every penny the wage *payer* pays the Government in taxes for extravagance is so much wages taken out of the wage *earner's* pocket.

What says a writer in the *Times* of June 17th ? He says, 'The Government of Mr. Gladstone has exhibited to the world astounding incompetency to deal with human affairs. . . . ' 'It has been a Government of failure. . . . ' 'It has left us without guns, without ships, and without allies, and therefore without safety,—it has been a government of bloodshed,—it has been a government of extravagant expenditure.'

By the way, I wonder how you would like to be invaded by Russia or Germany some day.

Now all this is true. In Egypt, Mr. Gladstone's Radical Government has caused the death of about sixty thousand men and the expenditure by Great Britain of more than twenty million pounds, and all for nothing? All this loss and frightful bloodshed has not brought the smallest good to the country in any sense whatever. If you wish this sort of thing to go on, you will vote for the Liberal; if not, I think you will vote for the Conservative.

You have heard of the Midlothian campaign

You know that when the Liberals came into office, five or six years ago, there were infinite promises of reform, retrenchment, and peace. And now that these years are passed you know what these promises are worth. You know, in fact, that they were just 'Radical Thumpers' to get votes. Did the tellers of them ever mean to carry the reforms out? Perhaps not. It is true that in Ireland they passed a big Land Bill to destroy liberty, and that in England they passed a very little Bill (something to do with rabbits, I believe), to destroy liberty. In a novel by Captain Marryat, a young unmarried woman had a child, and her defence of herself was, that it was 'a very little one.' Now, if the Liberals did not really wish for the great liberty-destroying reforms in England that they promised, of course they can defend themselves as the young woman did in Marryat's novel. Still, I believe they did wish to carry many of them, because, being more or less revolutionary people, they would naturally wish to do so.

A word more about Mr. Gladstone's Government. Do you know what is the most disgraceful thing that ever disgraced any Government? I will tell you.

Charles Gordon was the noblest hero of modern times. Well, Mr. Gladstone's Liberal Government sent him to defend a town, against hordes of Arabs, in the middle of Africa ; and then it left him to die like a rat in a hole. To the great disappointment of our Liberal Government he held out, against tremendous odds, for nearly a year ; but then he was killed. A scoundrel of a Radical Member of Parliament, after Gordon had been away six months and still held out, said, 'The best thing to happen would be for Gordon to die of typhus fever.' He only put into words what all Radicals thought. In fact, there can be not the least doubt that if it was thought that the crucifixion of a Jesus Christ would help the Liberal party, the genuine Radical would exult over it. This is what Radicalism or French Jacobism means all the world over. It means a total incapacity to understand heroism, or, indeed, good of any kind as distinguished from evil. 'Virtue and goodness,' says Shakespeare, 'to the vile seem vile.'

'The story,' says Sir Edward Sullivan, of the fall of Khartoum and the death of Gordon, 'is the most disgraceful page in English history.' But I am not sure that there is not one page as disgraceful, and that is, the conduct of the Liberal Government in Ireland. The duty of a Government is to put down all crime that *can* be put down. For months and months crime was rampant in West Ireland. At any time during

those months it could have been put down in a fortnight ; but the thing that calls itself our Government refused to move. That is to say, the members of it, being themselves out of personal danger, waited for months with callous heartlessness whilst men and women were being murdered and tortured in every conceivable way, without moving a finger to save them. Nor is it even as if many of the sufferers were landlords. In that case this criminal inaction would have been more comprehensible, when one considers the ridiculous class malignity of narrow-minded people towards landlords. But the sufferers were mostly small farmers, and other poor men, whose only offence was being a little more honest than their murderers and torturers.

A writer at that time says : ‘ What is the British public about, the respectable artisan class, that is, who elected these men to govern for them ? I know that the working man is comparatively ignorant, inasmuch as a man who gains his livelihood by manual labour has not time to gain much knowledge, but he is not dishonest, he is not heartless, he is not a money-embezzler, he is not, like the low-type West Irish and all savages, a sympathiser with crime and against law ; he is not incapable of indignation at cruelty and at those they have elected to put down crime refusing to do so. Surely if they could be got to realise the atrocities that have been permitted to take place, and to all appearance connived at, they would never rest till they had made a clean sweep, bag and baggage, of the impostors who have thrust themselves into office on

the false pretence that they would govern the country, and then week after week and month after month acquiesce, with every appearance of the calmest complacency, in these horrible West-Irish atrocities, never making an attempt even to govern, until at last they looked in the newspapers and saw symptoms that if they waited longer they might be losing popularity. Duty was nothing, right was nothing, terrible sufferings of innocent people were nothing, money embezzlement was nothing, revolutionary lawlessness was nothing ; but at last came personal fear of losing popularity.'

One more utterly disgraceful case : Besides the fifty or sixty thousand deaths in Africa, Mr. Gladstone's Government has caused the depopulation of a large district called the Dongola Province. This is the account given of it by a staff-officer in Egypt :—

' 12,700 wretched refugees have cleared out of the place, every one of whom is ruined, and the mass of whom will starve. Now, when we went up to Dongola last autumn the whole province was well-to-do and prosperous. The result of our occupation has been to ruin it completely. The whole place is desolate, and the town is absolutely deserted. We have turned all the inhabitants who were fairly thriving before into wanderers and beggars, and many of them will die of hunger. I do not believe that any nation ever committed a more cold-blooded, cowardly, wicked act of selfishness than we have done in our evacuation of Dongola.'

But I'll tell you another thing the Liberal Govern-

ment has done. In that part of Egypt called the Soudan it has destroyed the government as it was and set up none in its place, so that the country is given up to famine, misery, and disease, without help, and to crime without check. The sufferings of these poor Arabs is pitiable. They are dying by hundreds. I do not think a greater crime can be committed than destroying a government without putting up another in its place. And the test of the degree of the crime (as it is the test of all crime) is the degree of suffering caused. But what does the heartless Radical or Liberal care? Egypt is a long way off, and the Arabs have no votes to give him at the next election; so what can it signify? I am not saying, now that the thing is over, that we ought to subjugate the Soudan and govern it. No doubt this is impossible. The crime was destroying the government that existed without intending to replace it,

One more disgraceful fact. Lord Beaconsfield, foreseeing the Egyptian difficulty, obtained possession of Cyprus, with the view of posting soldiers within easy distance of Egypt. If the Conservatives had remained in office this would have been done, and there would have been no fighting in Egypt. But the Radicals would not make use of the island, because the Conservatives had gained possession of it. Thus they sacrificed the interests of their country to gratify their party malignity. The results we see—60,000 men killed in Egypt, the flourishing town of Alexandria in ruins, between twenty and thirty million pounds spent by Great Britain in causing these deaths

and this destruction, and famines, lawlessness, and misery in Egypt incalculable, and all for nothing!

Formerly, in such cases, the leading Radical statesmen would have been executed for treason. It is yet to be proved whether civilisation can last in countries where such treasonable crimes as these are not punished by death, as they have hitherto been since men have existed on the globe, till the last two or three hundred years. Malignity, as contrasted with benignity, is condemned by mankind, says science, because of the misery it has been observed to produce. Thus if the party malignity that leads to treason is to go unpunished, how can a country escape misery and ruin? No tribe of savages, even, could survive, if malignity was the rule of life amongst them as it is getting to be in England, amongst the Radical party.

But besides the Liberal Government having proved themselves haters of liberty, dishonest, revolutionary, imbecile, extravagant, and heartlessly cruel, they have also proved themselves to be cowards. I will give only one instance. Dutch Boers (who treat the natives as slaves), in South Africa, were in a state of insurrection five years ago. Our Government, thinking it would be easy to put the insurrection down, professed to be righteously shocked at the atrocities of the Boers, and so sent a few soldiers to put the insurrection down. But things turned out differently from what they expected. Instead of our soldiers putting the Boers down the Boers put our soldiers down. In fact, it was discovered that the Boers were remarkably good shots. At once our virtuous Government began to talk sancti-

moniously about blood-guiltiness, and crawled in the dust like a whipped hound at the feet of its master. It was like the big bully newly arrived at a school, who, meeting a little chap, cried out to him, 'Here, you young skunk, come and tie my boot-lace.' 'Mind what you are about,' whispered his companion; 'that little chap is the best fighter in the school.' 'Oh, never mind,' stammered the hulking coward, trembling from head to foot, 'the boot's all right, after all; here, would you like an apple? Here's one.'

No wise man blames a government for trying to avoid war. To wage war is often a duty, but it is a terrible duty, only to be resorted to when all other remedies fail. But to bluster and threaten because the antagonist is supposed to be weak, and then when the mistake is discovered to run away, is very contemptible. Of course all foreign nations laughed at us. Do you like being laughed at by foreign nations?

OUR FRENCH POLITICIANS.

OUR Liberal party, headed by Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Chamberlain, means the party that has adopted French Socialistic ideas. Now let us see what French Socialism means.

First, then, French Socialism or Jacobinism means war against property. War of the 'have-nots' against the 'haves.' Thus, every one who possesses so much as even one cow, one pig, one cottage, one share in a railway, one donkey-cart, or one piece of property of any kind whatever, should, and will, if he has a head on his shoulders, fight to the death on the other side. Again, Socialism also means filling a country with meddling and despotic officials, as they do in France, and thence destruction of liberty. Therefore a Conservative election cry ought to be, 'Liberty for ever, and down with French tyranny!' The aim of Socialists in all times is to overturn human society, and bring it more or less back to barbarism.

I must explain that there are three kinds of Socialists—'the gushing Socialist,' 'the millennial Socialist,' and the malevolent or envious Socialist. The gushing Socialist is an excellent man, who has nothing but vague feelings that a government should at once

provide everybody with riches and happiness. He has very small real intelligence, though he may have special talents like fluent oratory. The truth about any matter is for ever shut out from him. The millennial Socialist lives on foolish dreams of a coming millennium, when human nature is to be no longer human nature, and, indeed, when the laws of nature are to cease being laws of nature. He is often a good man, but always insane ; that is, he acts on dreams, not on facts. The malevolent Socialist works to overturn society from the motives of envy of people he supposes to be richer or more thought of than himself. Hatred is one the strongest of all motives for action, so the malevolent Socialist is the working partner in the firm. The two first classes, which are enormous ones, talk, gush, and maunder absolutely without limit. The Radicals or Socialists of the third class work. They have no scruples, and they form in every country the specially dangerous classes.

In the case of any one politician, however sure one may feel about his motives, absolute certainty is impossible. On the whole, we know that the working force of French Socialism and Radicalism is envy, hatred, and covetousness. But as I say, in individual persons it is, whatever the indications, impossible to be quite certain that the motive force is not personal ambition for notoriety and power, or crazy and dreaming millennialism, or even mere gushing foolishness. Thus, if in these pages I speak in an uncomplimentary way of leading Socialists, it is always with this reservation.

Our France-loving Radical statesmen, like most Socialists, ridicule the noble passion of patriotism. Indeed, they prefer the welfare of some country like France to that of their own, if that country's political institutions are more in accordance with their own ideas. Thus, if you elect the Liberal, that is, a supporter of our French statesmen, you must not be surprised if some day you see every English interest in the world sacrificed to French interests. However, to be forewarned is to be forearmed.

Our Socialists, Radicals, and Liberals, I say, jeer at patriotism. They think a man ought to aim at the good of France and Frenchmen quite as much as for the good of England and Englishmen. But patriotism is a noble natural passion, and as it is universally natural it is right. Patriotism, says the Radical, is nationally what selfishness is individually. But this, says Mr. Ruskin (an admirable writer), 'is the eternally damned modern view of the matter.' Sir Walter Scott calls the man without patriotism 'a wretch concentrated all in self;' and he is right. Every nation in which there is no patriotism becomes conquered sooner or later by some nation which has patriotism. Indeed, every nation that exists, exists because it has had patriotism, the most patriotic peoples having survived in the struggle of life between nations.

Here is an instance of the Radical want of patriotism. At the Cobden dinner in 1883, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain said that he anticipated injury to the British merchants and manufacturers when Free Trade in America should open out to them unrestricted com-

petition with that country. At the same time he himself tries, with all Cobdenites, to induce America to adopt Free Trade. That is, Mr. Chamberlain tries to bring about what he thinks will injure British merchants, British manufacturers, and all British industries. I think, my friends, you will think twice before you elect Mr. Joseph Chamberlain to reign over you.

Our French Socialists want to imitate France and to compel you to pay your members of Parliament large salaries for being members. What ! have you not rates and taxes enough already ? Are your wages so high that these payments will be nothing to you ? Besides any constituency can already, if it likes, pay a man who cannot otherwise afford to go into Parliament. But no, this would be liberty. And the despotic French Socialist hates liberty, so this would never do. The Socialists want to drill you and order you about like slaves. Of course if you wish to be slaves you can. But if not I think you will vote for the English Conservative who loves liberty instead of the French Radical or Liberal who hates it. 'The French,' said Napoleon, 'do not even understand the meaning of the word liberty.'

The ideas of our French politicians come in a great degree from Mr. J. S. Mill, who lived in France and was a complete Frenchman in his ideas. The Frenchman's idea of a happy state of society is a state where nobody has any children. He thinks that a man if he has no children will have more money to spend on himself and his own pleasures. The French act

on this detestable principle in a great degree. And a great French writer, M. Latourneau, says, that France must, if things go on as they now do, become a country with nobody in it. I think then, my friends, in spite of the Liberals, Socialists, and town Radicals laughing at you as ‘ignorant country bumpkins,’ that you have much too sharp wits to elect these Frenchmen, with Mr. Chamberlain at the head of them, to rule over you.

Mr. Froude, the historian, says that Radicalism knocked down the ancient Greek communities. This was about two thousand years ago. They never got up again, as you know.

Mr. Trevelyan was reported to have said in a speech that Radicalism may have ruined Greece, and Rome, and France, but that was no reason why it should ruin England. How does he know that? Human nature is very like human nature.

Whatever Liberalism has meant it means now French Socialism, to be brought about by universal suffrage. Rousseau, and his disciple Robespierre, started Socialistic ideas in France. Spain and the South American Republics followed. In fact, they come naturally to Celtic and Latin peoples. What is the result? Since the time of Rousseau the French Government has been three times overthrown by town mobs, three times by the army, and three times by foreign invasion, the invasion having each time been provoked by French aggression, and approved of by the French people. Look at Spain. Since 1812 there have in that country been forty military risings, in most of which the town mobs took part. Look at

the republics of Central and South America. Here we see almost continuous anarchy, civil war, and revolution. This is what history (and we have nothing else to go by) teaches about Socialism and Radicalism in modern times. In all revolutions all classes suffer, but the wage-earning working men suffer far the most. They get no wages, and therefore of course they starve to death. In the coming election you will have to choose. If you want revolution, loss of wages, and starvation, you will doubtless vote for the Radical or Liberal followers of our French politicians. If not, I think you will vote for the Conservative candidate.

The secret of national prosperity is honesty combined with stability in laws and habits. But the Socialist is from his nature a destroyer of stability. Endless revolutionary legislation to destroy confidence and stability is all he lives and works for. The Celt is, as I say, the specially Socialistic race. It is said of the French Celt that he does not know what he wants, and never will be contented till he gets it. Hence the revolutions with the terrible misery and starvation amongst the poorer classes that follow revolutions. The Socialist, J. S. Mill, passed his life agitating for changes, and thus destroying confidence and stability. But he honestly confessed that one day examining himself, he discovered that if these changes were brought about he would not be a bit the happier. He would then only want further revolution and change *ad infinitum*. Such is the Socialist or Radical mind.

You have been so accustomed to law and order that you will say there is no chance of revolution in

England. But people said just the same before the great revolution in France, with the terrible misery it produced. They went about their pleasures and business as usual, pooh-poohing all warning, till one fine day they found themselves with their heads in the guillotine basket. Possibly, in England, revolution would lead to less bloodshed. Still there would be the ruin. England is a great country. You think it cannot become a small one. Many years ago Rome was a great country. At that time no one believed it would ever be a small one. But the Radicals came, waged war on ownership of property, just as the same people are doing now in England. And Rome at once began to go down, till it became a very small country. In Rome, just as now, the Radicals attacked capital or ownership of money. When the money was invested largely in land they called it '*latifundia*.' It was successfully attacked by the Radicals, and down came Rome. If life and property in a country became unsafe, down comes that country. There is no exception to this law. Turkey was once a great country. Life and property became unsafe, and down came Turkey.

Our French Socialists, like Mr. Chamberlain and the demagogues, are generally very superficially educated, and little know that all their talk against capital and capitalists is only talk old as the hills, that has always been talked word for word when nations get to a certain stage of development. Mr. Froude, the great historian, thinks this follows when a nation's time has come as surely as a chrysalis be-

comes a butterfly. It was just the same in Rome. The demagogues waged, as I say, a successful war against property, capital, and '*latifundia*.' Honesty was thrown to the winds, exactly as in these days. Unrighteousness reigned. Property ceased to be safe, and then of course came the down-hill journey; then commenced 'the decline and fall of the Roman Empire.' Down she came, and down she has remained. So it threatens to be with Great Britain; and so no doubt it will be, nation after nation, as long as this earth lasts. Human nature is for ever human nature. In England the successful reign of the demagogue seems to be commencing, just as in ancient Rome and Greece. Mr. Gladstone's Government made laws legalising dishonesty and violation of solemn engagements; property thus became no longer safe, and at once come the necessary consequences, namely, loss of confidence in business; no employment in England for money; capital, brains, and enterprise driven abroad; and millions of money invested in America, Germany, the Colonies, and Belgium, instead of in Great Britain. All this does not mean that honest men should despair, or cease to exert themselves and to work against crime and Socialism. It means that they should work the harder. 'Never say die,' is one of the noblest of popular sayings. We have no reason from history to believe in any nation existing beyond a certain time, but what time that is no man can know. Even if a country can be saved for only a hundred years from returning to barbarism, with its brutalities, famines, diseases, filth, and misery, it will be a great

gain. There is many a brute in every civilised country, and in all classes ; but in a completely savage country everybody is a brute. If no Englishman will move a finger when he thinks his country is going to the dogs, the sooner she goes to the dogs the better. It must mean that Englishmen have so deteriorated that they are no longer fit to survive as a nation ; and the sooner a fitter race of men take their place the better. But I think you will move a finger, and I hope very effectually, at the coming election. You all can work on the side of order, liberty, and honesty, at any rate, by giving your votes. Others with leisure enough can work in other ways. Let him who can best work with his pen, work with his pen ; let him who can best work with his tongue, work with his tongue ; let him who can do good work with both, work with both. But any way work, for none can know the future. Whatever you do don't be like the Indian in the boat, who with his wife got into the rapids and were being carried down the falls of Niagara. As soon as the man thought there was no hope he dropped his oars and set to work upon the brandy bottle. But his wife kept pulling away to the last moment till over they went. And she was right. Now when you see the country in the hands of our French Socialists, and Radicals, or Liberals, as they now call themselves, do not drop your oars and betake yourselves to the brandy-bottle. 'Never say die!' Pull away to the last. Radicalism is the destructive and revolutionary devil of history. Then resist this devil, as I hope you do all devils. Do you know what Luther did when

the Devil tempted him? He threw the ink-bottle at his head. And if he had no other weapon at the moment he was right. We are told that of all weapons 'the sword of the Spirit' is the best one against the Devil and all his works. Still take any weapon you can lay your hands on, even if it is nothing better than an ink-bottle.

All your wages come from capitalists, for, besides the landowners, the farmers are capitalists who have invested their capital in horses, stock, ploughs, carts, and machinery. The Liberals and Radicals want to destroy the capitalists or wages-paying classes. They want to kill the goose that lays your golden eggs, and if you don't take care they will do it. The same people, as I have just said, succeeded in destroying capital and '*latifundia*,' or large land businesses, in Rome, and thence Rome herself. Why should they not succeed now? Indeed, they certainly will if you don't look out.

Where living men are concerned mathematical proof is impossible; so we cannot prove that there was any connexion between the 'decline and fall' of Rome, and the Socialistic or dishonest attacks on property in general and '*latifundia*,' as large capital when invested in land was called. Still, one proverb says that 'Honesty is the best policy,' and another that 'Righteousness exalteth a nation.' And therefore unrighteousness bringeth nations to the ground. Proverbs become proverbs on account of their truth and wisdom. Again, modern science says that dishonesty has the bad name it has because the experience of ages

has proved it to bring disaster and misery. Thus the evidence of the connexion is strong, though, as I say, mathematical proof is impossible. A man was tossed by a bull, and picked up dead. An action was brought by the relatives against the owner of the bull. The owner's defence was that it could not be mathematically proved that the death was caused by the bull ; the man might have been ailing and happened to die just at that time. However, the decision of judge and jury was against the owner of the bull.

'*Latifundia*' means large landed estates. Evidence proves that, as a rule, taking Great Britain through, the larger the landed estates are, the larger the produce from the land is ; the better the cottages, the better the school-buildings ; the better the churches, the better the chapels, the better off the farmers are, and the larger wages the labourers get. This is the great rule. The fact is, the larger a landowner's estate is, the more money he can afford to lay out on his property. In the bad years, the Duke of Bedford returned fifty per cent to his tenants, most of which went into your pockets as wages. A large landowner means an administrator of a large food-growing business, and large businesses are usually conducted better and more liberally than small ones.

Just like our modern revolutionists, Pliny waged war against '*latifundia*,' or large-landed capitalists. Cuvier, the great French naturalist, called Pliny an ignorant, discontented, ill-conditioned, 'carping' man ; that is, what we call now a Radical.

The more capital and capitalists there are in the world, the greater the demand must be for labour, and the higher the wages. If there was no such thing as capital, there could be no such thing as wages. To find this state of things absolutely we should have to go to the lower animals, but an approximation to it we no doubt find amongst some of the more degraded races of savages. It is only, too, amongst animals and the lowest savages that we find the sameness or equality at which the Socialist aims. This means that the Socialist, or Radical, aims at bringing men back to savagery. And they sometimes succeed in their aims.

Amongst the lowest savages, exceptional individual persons gradually begin to look beyond the present moment, to exercise self-control, and lay something up for the future ; or, in other words, to lay up capital and become capitalists ; and from that moment civilisation begins. Inequality begins, and civilisation begins. Till then man lives like the brutes. At length comes a time in nations when the inequality excites envy and hatred ; war against civilisation is consequently waged ; property becomes unsafe, and the road down-hill is taken, till at length barbarism again takes the place of civilisation, and men live the lives of brutes again. Such is the teaching of history, and we have nothing else to go by.

You will perhaps say that some of our Liberal and Radical statesmen of the French school are rich men, and therefore will not favour legislation that

leads to revolution. But history tells us that it is not so. Ambition for notoriety, place, and power, sometimes completely takes the place of desire to make or keep wealth. Besides, rich Radicals invest their money in other countries, and then do not mind what happens to their own. If they are clever, eloquent men, they get their notoriety, and keep their money too.

The aim of our Radicals and town French Socialists is to ruin the country wage-paying class, and to impoverish landlords ; and perhaps they will succeed in this, as they have succeeded before in ruining whole nations. Well, how much better off will you be when the wage-payers are half ruined and the landlords made poor ? Your kitchen-boiler has got a hole in it. How can your landlord give you a new one if he is as poor as a church mouse ? You want a new gate to your garden. You need not ask your landlord for a new one, for his own garden gate is in the same state, and he cannot afford to get a new one even there. A gale of wind strips the roof of your house. You will have to put it on again yourself. On the whole, my friends, I think it would be more to your advantage to vote for the Conservative, who wishes to preserve what is good and to reform what is bad, than for the Radical French Socialist, who only wants to destroy every existing thing because it is existing !

I repeat that the aim of the Radical politician of large towns is to ruin the agricultural interest. Mr. J. Morley, in his *Life of Cobden*, tells us how this began

in England. The Conservative, or country party, headed by Lord Ashley, had passed an Act regulating the hours for women and children to work in factories. ‘Before that time,’ says Mr. Morley, ‘there was a state of things hardly less horrible than that of negro slavery. Young girls were constantly employed till eleven at night ; and as darkness set in the factory was little better than a brothel.’

The rich town Radical manufacturers, like Mr. J. Bright, says, Mr. Morley, offered the strongest opposition to Lord Ashley’s Act, and were determined to be revenged. This was the origin of the striving of the town Radicals in England to ruin the agricultural interest. And these strivings have been perseveringly carried on ever since with much success. But I think, my friends, now that you have votes you will put a stop to them. If not, you are less sharp than I take you to be. It is true that the town Radicals are always laughing at you and calling you mere stupid ‘Country Bumpkins’ (this is their favourite phrase) ; but I think, as I have said, that you will now prove that they are wrong in calling you so. The town Radicals have had the voting power in their hands hitherto. Now it is your turn.

Are you aware that you, with all agriculturists, pay to keep town people in a state of pauperism ? A pauper means a man who receives the benefits of civilisation without paying anything. To give only one instance : the rich town man who drives on country roads without paying anything for the use of them is a pauper living so far at your expense.

The Conservative wishes to remedy this injustice, by making town people pay just rates. The Radical, who hates the agricultural interest, wishes to leave things as they are. You will have to choose at the next election between these parties, whether you will continue to let rich town men live in a state of pauperism on your charity or not.

Do you understand the trickery of the Liberal party in giving you votes? I will explain it to you. The leading Liberals wanted an election triumph. So they proposed to give you votes. They thought the popularity this would bring them would do the trick. Now, the new agricultural votes would only amount to two millions, whereas the towns had three million votes; so the Liberals thought the town votes would swamp the country votes, and that thus they would at the same time get their popularity and safety from too much agricultural influence too. But the Conservatives would not have this, and they forced the Liberals to pass a Bill to redistribute seats, so that the agricultural votes might not be swamped by the town votes.

If it had not been for the Conservatives, with Lord Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote at the head, you would have got your votes, no doubt, but no power with them. Sharp bit of trickery this of the Liberals, no doubt; but, like most sharp practices, it did not succeed in the end. After all, there is nothing like the old saying, 'Honesty is the best policy.' So it is. A rogue will succeed for a time, but sooner or later he always comes to grief.

All modern Liberalism or Socialism came first from the French writer Rousseau, who had great intellect of its kind. Morally he was the worst man ever mentioned in history. He was below the lowest savages, and even below the brutes, for brutes have, at any rate, some natural good affections. But Rousseau had none. He had many children, each one of which he sent immediately it was born to the foundling hospital and never saw it again. Rousseau was a pure devil. For devilism means intellect without goodness. A pig cannot be wicked, for it has no intellect. Rousseau's envious and diabolic hatred of all good was such that he wished to destroy civilisation, and bring all men to the state of what he called 'the noble savage.' A complete savage, you know, means a man who is a thief, a murderer, and adulterer, because nothing better than theft, murder, and adultery has been discovered. Rousseau was mad, and bad or diabolic in the utmost degree ; but, as I say, he had great eloquence and intellect, so he had great power for evil, and has been the cause of endless revolutions in the world, with consequent misery absolutely incalculable. Now all modern Socialists from Robespierre downwards are simply Rousseau's spawn, and often sentimental just like him. They use exactly the same jargon about 'the social contract,' and 'natural rights of man,' that he used. All educated men now of course know that these terms, as he used them, have no true meaning whatever. Still, though they do know this, our educated French Socialists in England use such terms because they think they will help them in

deluding and getting the votes of ignorant people. Now I know that most of you have not time to acquire great knowledge, but I think you have too much hard English common sense to allow yourselves to become the dupes of these followers of the heartless sentimentalist Jean Jacques Rousseau.

The Liberal or Radical party in Great Britain means, I say, the party that admires and tries to imitate the French people. Their aim is to turn you all into Frenchmen, thinking French thoughts, living French lives. The leaders of this French party are, as you know, Mr. J. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke. Sir Charles Dilke lives in France, and Mr. Chamberlain is a friend of the leading French statesman on the revolutionary side. The English writer whose principles our French politicians most admire is the Socialist, Mr. J. S. Mill, who lived in France. And you are all to be turned into Frenchmen! How do you like the idea? The political action of statesmen in France is founded on Atheism, and the destruction not only of Christianity but of religion in all its forms.

All wise men know that Christianity, and Christianity alone, destroyed slavery. Thus if Christianity in a country is destroyed, slavery must come back again.

Christianity also put an end, after a long struggle, to tortures in prisons. French Statesmen are destroying Christianity in France, and what do we find? Monsieur Guyot, a French writer, says, that torture is now practised in French prisons. Any one of you may find yourself in prison some day. Many an

honest and innocent man finds himself in prison some day. No human laws are infallible, and justice sometimes fails. How would you like to be tortured?

The French Socialists, or Jacobins, whom our English Liberal party admires so much, form a heartless party of men without conscience, without religion, and without a God. But many of them believe in physical science, and in physical science alone. Now Socialism means wishing to take men back to the Socialist customs of feudal and half-barbarous times, when there was no liberty and no independence, and when governments managed the people as if they were so many sheep and inferior animals. And what do you think used to take place in those days in the interest of science? I will tell you. In Italy men, sometimes innocent, who had been condemned for some supposed offence, were handed over to doctors to be dissected alive. Do you wish the country to return to the customs of those Socialistic times? If you do I recommend you to vote for the Liberal candidate.

Next to direct theft, or ‘expropriation without compensation,’ as they call it, the aim of our Socialist or French statesmen is to legalise the violation of contracts and solemn engagements.

What happens to a nation that legalises theft or crime? ‘To decree injustice by law,’ says Carlyle, ‘inspired prophets have long since seen, what every clear soul may see, that of all anarchies and devil-worships there is none like this. Quiet anarchy, you say. Yes, quiet anarchy, which the longer

it is quiet will have the frightfuller account to settle at last.'

The ways this retribution works are infinite. Here is one. The greatness of a country depends on the brains, honesty, and energy in it. But if a Government makes dishonest laws, off goes the honesty to other countries. If a Government renders property unsafe, off go brains and energy to other countries. Nobody, if he can help it, will stay to be robbed by Socialists. A good deal of this depopulation is supposed to have taken place in France. Mr. Galton thinks the degeneracy of France has come partly from the liberty-loving and honesty-loving Teutonic people having been gradually eliminated during the last hundred years, leaving nothing but Celts. Some shallow Radicals call the dishonest Irish Land Bill a success. But what is one year, two years, or three years of fine seasons? Wait fifty years, until the honesty, brains, and energy have had time to clear out of the country and escape from the Socialism, with its rogueries, slaveries, famines, and miseries. 'God's mill,' says the proverb, 'grinds *late*, but then it grinds to powder.'

You are an industrious saving man and have invested your money in three acres of land. You let this ground for two pounds an acre for a potato garden. To make sure, you have a written and signed contract or agreement that this rent shall be paid. But our French Socialists hate this liberty to make an agreement, as they hate all liberty, so they pass a law to legalise the violation of it, and your tenant is no

longer bound to pay the rent. It will, of course, be the same if you become owner of a house, a shop, or any other kind of property. Now if you like this tyrannical, despotic, thieving, and liberty-destroying legislation, you can help it on by voting for the Liberal. If not I think you will vote for the Conservative, who believes in the good old saying that 'Honesty is the best policy.'

Do you know how the word Socialist is spelt? I will tell you. The way to spell it is T, H, I, E, F.

The genuine Socialist or Communist wants to steal all property, more or less, in one way or another. One Socialist wants to take it bodily, whilst another wants to tax it so that it ceases to be property worth anything; but the crime aimed at is the same with all of them. One man picks a pocket directly, another man indirectly, by forgery or by selling a quantity of goods, say manure, which is half made of brick dust. But the crime is the same in both cases; the same commandment is broken. They are both thieves. Thus we see that, however Socialists disagree as to details, there is in principle complete harmony, agreement, and unanimity amongst them. They all agree to become thieves. This is very charming in a world of discord. How has it come about? Some people when they are young are taught a hymn by Dr. Watts, beginning 'Birds in their little nests agree,' &c. I really think the Socialists must have learned the same hymn when they were young. I need hardly say that the inciter to crime is a worse criminal than the direct doer of it. To say nothing else he will be a

coward in addition, inasmuch as he dare not do what he wishes to do. Since Christianity we know that criminality depends on what is in the heart. ‘He that *hateth* his brother is a murderer!’ ‘He who looketh on a woman to lust after her has already committed adultery in his heart.’ He who looketh on a cotton mill, or looketh on a hundred acres of land, to lust after them, hath already committed theft in his heart.

Socialists are not all thieves. Some are, as I have said, amiable, gushing people, who are totally without intelligence to understand the ruin Socialism brings ; whilst others are dreamers about an immediately approaching millennium, when human nature is going to be different from what it has ever been before, when war is going to cease upon the earth, and when everybody in it is going for ever to have as much to eat and drink for nothing as he wants. But however well-meaning some of these millenarian Socialists may be, they are insane people.

Socialists are proverbially materialists and atheists.

The late Sir Robert Peel used to say : ‘As a general rule, it would be as well not to trust one’s purse to any man who tells you that he does not believe in a God, whatever merits in other respects such a man may possess.’

If this is true, can we wonder that the leading political principle of Socialists and Communists is crime or theft?—a principle often carried out by that most diabolic form of it, namely, inciting ignorant people to legalise theft and crime. Perhaps this is the utmost extreme to which human depravity can be

carried, leading as it does, according to history, to the most terrible retribution, in the form of revolutions, misery, and ruin to nations.

Doctor Johnson, on the departure of an atheist who had been calling on him, was seen counting his silver spoons.

H. Heine, the great poet, said, in his odd manner, ‘that religion and morality are ham and bacon,—two aspects of the same thing,—and that when, in a nation, religion goes down, down goes morality too.’ History proves this to be true.

Of the criminal classes, the most criminal are not the doers of criminal deeds, such as theft or homicide, but those who incite others to do them, whilst they are too great cowards to take an actual part themselves.

A trumpeter being taken prisoner in a battle, begged for quarter. ‘Spare me,’ said he, ‘and put me not to death, for I have killed no one myself, nor have I any arms but this trumpet only.’

‘For that very reason,’ said they who had seized him, ‘shall you the sooner die, for, without the spirit to fight yourself, you stir up others to warfare and bloodshed.’

Moral.—He who incites to strife is worse than he who takes part in it.—*Æsop's Fables*.

Even the actual ‘dynamite devils’ themselves are not so diabolical as the inciters to dynamite devilry, even though they be ‘honourable’ Members of Houses of Parliament.

Can you wonder that millions upon millions of pounds are invested abroad instead of getting into your pockets as wages, when the leading Liberals more and more every day try to make ownership of

property of all kinds unsafe in England ? Besides enormous quantities of manufacturing businesses taken abroad, enormous quantities of land are being bought in America by Englishmen. I know a man who sold a large property and took the money to New Zealand. New Zealand is as yet free from Socialism. All this money lost to England means wages taken out of your pockets. In fact, the Radical, or, as they call themselves, Liberal politicians, are always robbing you of your wages, for all the money of a rich man goes sooner or later into the pockets of working men of one kind or another. Without national or government honesty with respect to property, prosperity in a country is impossible. ‘ Righteousness exalteth a nation.’

French Socialism means theft. It means the rising of the criminal classes against morality. M. Taine, a great French writer, says ‘that the French Revolution was simply a rising of the criminal classes against order, law, and morality,—a successful rising, because the party of order and law, including the Government, were too weak to resist. So it always has been in the history of the world. When the orderly part of a nation becomes effeminate and indolent, the criminal part has it all its own way. If you, the respectable working men, will not exert yourselves to oppose, by your votes, those energetic criminals, some of them in high places, who devote themselves to inciting the people to theft and crime, you cannot expect anything else than what happened, from the same causes, in France, —namely, endless revolutions and infinite misery.

France has taught the world much about Radicalism or Socialism. If it had not been for the lessons that country has given us, London would long since have been in ashes like Paris a few years ago, and the country grovelling in Communism. France has suffered, but the world has learnt.

It cannot be too often repeated that Socialism or the Liberalism of the present day means, in its essence, attacking ownership of property. ‘But all history,’ says Bulwer, ‘tells us that when property is invaded the reign of arbitrary power is at hand. Better one despot than a reign of robbers.’ But before the despot comes, revolution comes. Do you want first, revolution, and then the despot ? If you do, you had better vote for the Liberal.

The Liberal or Radical of the day is an absolutely heartless man. Put generally and broadly, a Radical means a man whose aim is to destroy the wealth of all more or less rich men, from whom your wages come. This necessarily means putting none in the place of what is destroyed. Thus, in whatever country he succeeds (and, as history tells us, he often has succeeded), all workers in things men in civilised countries value are ruined. But what does the heartless Radical care ? The working men who make watches are ruined ; but what does the heartless Radical care ?—The working men who make carriages are ruined ; but what does the heartless Radical care ?—The working men who make jewelry are ruined ; but what does the heartless Radical care ?—The working men who build houses are ruined ; but what

does the heartless Radical care ?—The working men who make furniture are ruined ; but what does the heartless Radical care ?—The working men who grow flowers and fruit are ruined ; but what does the heartless Radical care ?—The working men who turn out silks and stuffs for dress are ruined ; but what does the heartless Radical care ?—In fact, all the working men who work at those things that men in nations above barbarism value, are ruined ; but what does the heartless Radical care ? If he can only ruin those people who are richer than himself he cares for nothing. He has, as I say, and as history tells us, often succeeded and brought back countries from civilisation to barbarism and helpless weakness, and, no doubt, he often will again. The fact is, the more rich men there are in a country the more well-to-do working men there will be, and the greater number of happy well-to-do people of innumerable kinds there will be compared with the numbers of miserably poor ones.

The Socialist or Radical is absolutely heartless. He professes to love the poor, but really he only envies and hates the rich. He is like the Puritans of old when they put down bear-baiting. They said they did this from pity to the bears. They really did it, as the great historian Macaulay said, ‘not because they pitied the bears, but because they hated and envied the rich, whose amusement bear-baiting was.’

Socialism is, of course, often a mere question of ownership of property. Dean Ramsay tells us of a man in Scotland, named Davy Armstrong, who was at one time the hottest of red-hot Radicals. A few

years afterwards a fellow-Socialist, who had been away from the village all this time, returned and commenced the old way of talking. But Davy did not respond, and he found that his old fellow-grumbler had become a rank Tory. Very much shocked at this discovery, he asked how it had come about. 'I've a coo noo,' said Davy.

A newspaper, a year or so ago, told us of Mr. Chamberlain talking about the future, and saying to some one, 'Before long Gladstone will die; then the Conservatives will come in for a bit; then I shall come in; and then I'll smash everything.' 'Smashing everything' of course means revolution. This story may, or may not, be true. Still, it is the sort of familiar way Mr. Chamberlain has of talking about important things, and 'smashing everything,' corresponds with his public speeches and with the fact that, he is the personal friend of the leading French revolutionary statesman of the day; so, most likely, the story is true.

If you want everything that has made England what she is to be 'smashed,' of course you will vote for the Liberal, that is, the follower of Mr. Chamberlain.

A Conservative not long ago made a speech in which he attacked the revolutionary principles of Mr. Chamberlain, whereupon the *Pall Mall Gazette* said that it was making a great fuss about a mere second-class politician like Mr. Chamberlain. But this was a mistake. If danger to a country comes from any particular politician, it must be from some second or third-class one. A first-class politician is never

dangerous to his country. The great historian, Mr. Froude, tells us that the ancient Greek States were ruined by self-seeking, ignorant, and often eloquent demagogues. But human nature is for ever human nature. Mr. Chamberlain may or may not be self-seeking, but that he is our old friend (so familiar to us from the time of the ancient Greeks), the popular demagogue, is undeniable.

Our French Radicals propose to bring in a Bill to confiscate (steal) all small agricultural holdings that have been acquired during the last fifty years by absorbing plots of ground from commons and cultivating them. This Act, if carried, would ruin thousands of small cottagers who have acquired their half-acre, one-acre, two-acre, or three-acre plots in this way. But what does the Socialistic Radical care so long as he satisfies his hatred of people who live in the country?

The Liberals or Radicals impose heavy death duties. This is the worst or most oppressive form of income-tax, and one that sometimes comes cruelly upon working people.

A man with a large establishment dies. His successor has so great a death-duty to pay that he has to shut up his establishment and economise. Old servants who have been thirty years perhaps on the place have to leave and find other situations if they can, whilst old pensioners, kept on from charity, of whom there are generally several in a large establishment, whether in towns or country, must go to the workhouse or die. This is only one

out of innumerable instances to show how absolutely callous to the sufferings of poor people the Radical is.

If a Government wants more income tax let them put it on in the usual way. But no, that would not cause misery enough. There would be no *sudden* change to anybody. No destruction anywhere. Radicals always aim at revolutions. If they cannot get them on a large scale they try to get them on a small. But nature hates sudden and violent changes, for they always cause misery. Nearly all nature's doings are gradual, except earthquakes, and they cause infinite misery. But Radicals only imitate nature in this exception to her doings, and of course they too cause infinite misery. The Conservative is for gradual reform when required. The Radical or Liberal is for destruction, revolution, and 'smashing everything.' Do you want revolutions and earthquakes? Then vote for the Liberal.

One Socialist scheme is for *all* England to become common land again, owned by everybody in general and nobody in particular. Mr. Chamberlain is called a clever man, but he seems a strangely puzzle-pated one. He says that land ought to be in common, *because* it was in common in barbarous and savage times. Then women ought to be in common, because they were so in early times ; and wearing a skewer through the nose for ornament is the right thing, because it was done in barbarous times. The true inference is, of course, the exact opposite one to that of Mr. Chamberlain. This does not prove that all England should not be brought back to its original

state, when nothing was on its surface but marshes, swamps, forests, whins, and brushwood ; it only shows that Mr. Chamberlain's reason why it should be so is only confusion of mind.

How can we account for such confusion of mind ? Is it possible that it arises from class antipathy ? It may be so. George Eliot says that want of goodwill always condemns a man to corresponding stupidity. This truth cannot be too often repeated, because it seems the only way to explain the utter stupidity often shown by some Radicals who were intended by nature to be somewhat intelligent men.

Some Liberals tell you that you should buy land, and become, like Frenchmen, peasant-proprietors. This sounds very plausible, but where are you to get the money to buy it, implements to work it, and stock to stock it ? England used to be full of peasant-proprietors. The system has almost died out, because *it did not pay* so well to own land as to hire it. A man, we will say, was owner of a hundred acres of land. He found he had forty pounds a-year to live, or rather starve, upon, and that his farm got into a worse state every year for want of capital to farm it well. He sold the land and became the purchaser's tenant. Then he found that he had 100*l.* to live on every year, and his land kept constantly improving in condition. This sort of thing has been going on in England for many years. There is a peasant proprietary in France, a country with a far better soil and climate than England. But the thing is a failure. Little more than half the produce comes from the land per acre

compared with the produce in England, and the peasant-proprietors live lives of dirt, penury, and slavery to man, woman, and child (if there is a child). The women have to work unceasingly in the fields ; they have no time to attend to their cottages, which consequently are filthy. These landowners are so poor that they cannot afford fuel, so for warmth in winter they sleep at night in the cow-houses, with the pigs and beasts. They are too poor to afford to have children, so they have scarcely any. The French are extremely penurious, and they are content to live on sour bread, sour, weak wine, and nothing else. But you are not content with such fare. You are not penurious and cheese-paring skinflints. You have a generous, open-handed, independent English nature, and you want a good dinner every day, and a good glass of good beer with it. But if a French skinflint cannot keep himself from miserable poverty and wretchedness, how would you, with a manly instead of a womanly disposition, and a far worse climate and soil than the Frenchman has got ? Goethe, the celebrated German poet, called Frenchmen 'the women of Europe.' And what do we see ? We see the manly English and German races spreading themselves over the earth, filling continents, and out-competing the French everywhere in colonizing, in commerce, and in enterprise. So it looks as if Goethe was right. I repeat, do not allow yourselves to be turned into Frenchmen by Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Charles Dilke, and our other French politicians. Indeed, I feel sure that you know a trick worth two

of that, although they do laugh at you as Country Bumpkins, so stupid that you cannot find out the lies told you by the Radicals, and therefore sure to be easily duped.

Amongst the wretched French peasants who own their bits of land, a man has been seen ploughing, the plough being pulled by his wife and a donkey.

There is one thing to improve the condition of the money-saving agricultural labourer, and that is the power to hire allotments of land, varied in size according to the means of the hirer. This is the Conservative's view of the matter, and to get this power all of you should agitate in those parts of England where it does not already exist.

Peasant proprietary has been gradually dying out because it does not pay. A farmer who rents a little farm finds he has 200*l.* a-year to live upon, whereas if he owns it he has 100*l.* a-year. This is in consequence of that peculiarity of human nature according to which large English landowners are content with very small interest (rent) for their capital, and because they, as a rule, take a pride in improving their property. But human nature is the last thing a Radical politician thinks of. If a peasant proprietary is contrary to the natural course of things or laws of nature in an old country inhabited by Anglo-Teutonic men, forcing it upon such a country will be like forcing water to run uphill. Undoubtedly a town can be supplied with water by forcing it at an enormous cost from a low level, but perhaps on the whole it had better be allowed to come

from above, and reach the level of the town according to nature's laws.

Mr. Boyd Kinneard defends a peasant proprietary because where it still lingers he has 'known it answer fairly well.' Well, a cow answers fairly well on straw and water, but it answers very well on turnips and oil-cake. There is, I need hardly say, nothing new in the Socialist's aim at a return to the peasant proprietary of half-barbarous times. Feargus O'Connor tried it. But the deluded peasants were soon ruined, and ended by cursing poor Feargus and all his schemes. In fact, they had no capital, no stock, no implements, and no manure. Mr. Chamberlain is, I believe, a town gentleman engaged in trade, so one cannot be surprised that he does not know that stock, implements, capital, and manure, have anything to do with farming. But this being so, surely he might make inquiries of people who do understand about these things. Still, though for a labouring man to own a bit of land does not pay him nearly so well as hiring it, some seem to prefer owning to hiring. Therefore it is desirable that the means of becoming an owner should be put within your reach. With this object a company has been formed, called 'The Small Farm and Labourers' Land Association,' which may do good work; but whatever you do, resist Government meddling in such a matter, as I hope you do the Devil and all his works; for whenever and wherever a Government meddles it always muddles. Jobbery, roguery, and extravagance always come of it. The Socialists or Liberals aim at this Government meddling.

But what it really means is this. It means trying to force on the country an army of Government officials and an enormous increase of rates and taxes to pay their salaries. It means unlimited bribery and corruption. It means political parties giving appointments to men, and thus bribing them for their votes and political support. Government officialism is one of the many curses of France, and our own French politicians want to force this curse, as well as all the other French curses, on England.

If you wish to be meddled with by Government officials every hour of every day I think you had better vote for the Liberal candidate.

Some few exceptional working men will do fairly well as peasant-proprietors so long as they themselves are alive. Therefore, all impediments to such men becoming possessors of bits of land ought to be removed by making land as easy to sell as a cow is, as far as it is possible to do so.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* of January 15th, 1885, says that there is little or no difference between the political principles of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Henry George.

And what are the principles of Mr. Henry George? He says that if a poor man has saved money, buys three acres of land and lets it for two pounds an acre, this land, or the interest from and value of it, is to be stolen from him—taken from him without any compensation. In fact, this poor man has become a landlord, or land-owning capitalist, and so with all other capitalists (the people who pay you your

wages), they are to be swept from off the face of the earth.

Socialists want the State to steal all the land in the country and become the universal landlord, and a very hard landlord it would be. But besides being necessarily a hard landlord, a Government would be an unjust one. ‘Never,’ said Thurlow, ‘expect justice from a company. It has neither a soul to lose nor a body to kick.’ But a Government is a company. Nobody can kick a Government, often as it deserves kicking.

The plan of stealing all land by the State is called, in the jargon of the people who advocate it, ‘the nationalisation of land.’ When applied to railway property it is called ‘the nationalisation of railways.’ In France the Socialists, whilst advocating these, insist most on the nationalisation of other kinds of property.

Socialism is fighting for a return to savagery against civilisation. Then a good election cry would be, ‘Civilisation for ever! Down with savagery!’ A savage means a dirty, thievish, homicidal, and adulterous man, who is so poor and miserable that he does not know one day whether he will have anything to eat the next day or not.

Like you I am a Country Bumpkin, and when the election comes I shall vote for the Conservative candidate, and not for the follower of our French politicians and statesmen (so called). I shall not vote for that most illiberal of men, ‘the Liberal’ of the present time. I shall vote for the Conservative, because I am an Englishman who loves liberty, and is opposed to theft, dishonesty, extravagance, and revolution. Any

man who votes for the Liberal, knowing what he is about, is not an Englishman, but a Frenchman. He is voting for despotism, extravagance, and dishonesty. The manly Englishman loves independence and liberty. The effeminate Frenchman, whose ruling passions are, as Balzac, the great French writer, says, vanity and envy, hates liberty because it necessarily destroys the sameness or equality that all people with envious dispositions strive by all kinds of tyrannical legislation to force on nations. But this sameness is only found amongst the lowest savages.

French Socialism is, as I have said, atheistic and religionless. Do you think that religions of every kind, and morality, are folly? Heine, as I have told you, says that religion and morality 'are ham and bacon'—the same thing, in fact; that there cannot be general morality without religion. 'But morality and honesty,' says that good writer, Matthew Arnold, 'are absolutely essential to the existence of countries. Rome, Greece, Babylon,' he says, 'all the old civilisations, down they toppled like so many rotten ninepins, from want of morality and conduct.' Do you wish England to topple down like the rotten ninepins, Rome, Greece, and Babylon? If you do you will no doubt vote for the Liberal, or follower of our Socialistic French Radicals and atheists. 'Man alone,' says Goethe, 'is a religious animal; and those who would degrade his nature to that of brutes, begin by extinguishing in him the sense of religion.' This is just what the French Socialists unceasingly try to do.

Town Radicals, too narrow-minded to see that all classes are necessary to each other in a great country, hate the dwellers in the country, and do all in their power to ruin them, which is the same as if a man's liver was to set to work to injure and destroy the lungs. These town Radicals are always laughing at 'Country Bumpkins.' For years Liberals have in their speeches been unceasingly making jeering allusions to you who live in the country as 'the stupid party;' but mind you, they will not make use of this phrase when they stump the country, and beg you for your votes. No ; then they will tell a different story. They will say that you have been kept from the power of voting by the wicked Tories, and that such a highly intelligent class of people as you are, should have had votes at least five hundred years ago. In fact, the atheistic Radicals and Socialists of large towns are what is called in the Bible, very 'wise in their generation,' which, as I need not say, means, to put it in modern English phraseology, 'very great rogues.' A great American writer, the Rev. Theodore Parker, says that a man who knows how to grow turnips is a better educated man than one who is nothing but a clever lawyer, inasmuch as the first knows a piece of real useful knowledge, whereas the last only knows how to talk and 'prove the worse to be the better cause.' Of course, the lawyer *seems* the best educated man, because his profession is to talk plausibly. Lord Brougham was a great lawyer. He was once showing some ladies over a brewery, and explained everything to them very eloquently. The foreman of the works

said, when they had gone, ‘Well, I never in my life heard such a lot of lies in so short a time as that lawyer chap told those ladies.’ If one man has no conscience, no knowledge of the difference between good and evil, and no faculty but that of proving ‘the worse to appear the better cause,’ and another man has a conscience, and knows the difference between right and wrong as well as how to grow turnips, the second man is by far the better educated one of the two.

The Radicals and Socialists want to do away with all the parsons. How much good would that do? Is the parson of no use to you? He is generally a well-educated man. Does he never give you any good advice when you are in some difficulty?—What, never? Does he never give you a job in his garden when you are out of work?—What, never? Does he never visit you when you are sick?—What, never? Does his wife never help yours in any way when she has a sick child?—What, never? Well, if all this is true, and it may be true, for there is a black sheep or two in all flocks, vote for the Radical, and he will do away not only with your parson but with all parsons. But if you think a kind, well-educated man in a parish a good thing, I think you will vote for the Conservative.

But, perhaps, you are Wesleyans, and have a minister of your own. Well, is your parish so small that there is not room for two good men helping you to live sober, honest, decent, orderly, temperate, and clean lives? To be sure the buildings in which these good men try to help you with their advice are called by two different names, ‘Church’ and ‘Chapel.’ But

if the advice is good what does that matter ? If parsons and ministers teach nothing but evil, pack them off by all means. But I myself think that, as a rule, they preach nothing but good.

English Radicalism, which is the same as French Jacobinism, hates parsons ; first, because the parsons believe in Almighty God ; secondly, because they disbelieve in revolutions being useful to a country.

A French Jacobin, an English Radical, and a Socialist, all mean the same atheistical people who, as I say, hate parsons for being opposed to revolution. What do you think a French Radical Parliament once did ? I'll tell you. They brought in a bill to abolish Almighty God, and they passed the bill. But men and women *must* look up to something, so they set up what they called the Goddess 'Reason' to worship instead. And what does 'reason' mean ? It means a talent for mathematics and lawyers' logic-chopping. Thus, instead of praying to the good God who fills universes with joy, men and women were to adore mathematics and logic. They might as well tell men to fall down on their knees and worship an equilateral triangle or a lawyer's wig. Still, if this is your idea of religion, I advise you to vote at the coming election for the Liberal candidate or French Socialist. At any rate you will get revolution if that's what you want.

A few more words about the dishonesty and unrighteousness of Socialism. Socialism means at bottom the old old war against riches and capitalists. It means war against capitalists, whether the capital be

invested in a house, a bit of land, a shop, a cotton mill, a carrier's cart, railway shares, or the public funds. If you have saved fifty pounds you are a capitalist, and as a capitalist the Socialist tries to ruin you, either by unjustly taxing you or in some more direct way. If he succeeds beyond a certain degree history tells us that either revolutions, ending in military despotism, take place, or a country slowly, but surely, falls back to barbarism, for civilisation comes from safety to life and property.

The remedy against Socialism is Conservatism, which wants to preserve what is good and reform what is bad. Socialism, Radicalism, and Liberalism want to destroy. Formerly Liberalism meant reforming what was bad. Now it means Socialism. Mr. Gladstone has done good work in his life, but now he is a very old man, and though he still has much strength and eloquence for his age, he has lost his power of mind and strength of character. Thus he has become a mere tool in the hands of our French Socialists and revolutionists, as was proved by his encouraging revolution and destroying liberty in Ireland, and his reactionary or socialistic and communistic legislation in that country contrary to the progress-loving principles of his whole life. The Socialists and Liberals dread Mr. Gladstone retiring into private life, and thus losing his name and his popularity, so they flatter the poor old man up to his eyes. Sharp rogues the Socialists! But mind you do not despise this sharpness and cunning. It has produced many a revolution in the world, and

thus caused infinite misery. In the coming days it will require all the wisdom of the wise and the honesty of the honest to counteract it, and thus stave off miserable disaster to the nation.

Bishop Magee says that the word ‘cunning’ means sharpness of wits without moral qualities. As soon as you got votes up jumped our French politicians and set to work to bribe you with promises, and bamboozle you with ‘Radical Thumpers.’ The Radicals, whenever the suffrage is widened, always think, ‘Now is our time; we can easily persuade the new ignorant voters that Socialism is right, liberty wrong, honesty no better than dishonesty, religion superstition, morality nonsense, and patriotism absurd.’

And yet does it *never* occur to you, you miserable rogues! that possibly the majority of the new voters may not be fools and may not be rogues? I do believe it never does. ‘Virtue and goodness to the vile seem vile.’ They do not believe in such things. Just as ‘to the pure all things are pure,’ so to the rogue all men are rogues.

Honest men were startled a year or two ago by a Californian Communist, who taught the doctrine of confiscating or stealing all capital of every kind everywhere. The poor man who, after a life of industry, had saved money and bought three acres of land, or invested it in railway-shares, or in the public funds, is, according to this man, to be despoiled of every penny of it. Payment of debts, national or private, is not to be enforced, and the word honesty is to be removed from the language of men.

'The world,' says a writer in the *Nineteenth Century*, writing about this American Communist, 'the world has never seen such a preacher of unrighteousness. For he goes to the root of things, and teaches that all rules of probity are unfounded.

An inciter to crime is, as I have said, a worse man than the doer of it. Fagan, the Jew, who incited to murder, was a worse man, that is, a more diabolical one, than Bill Sikes, who was only a brute.

A criminal-class man simply means a man without honesty or conscience. He may be too great a coward to risk actual conviction ; but this makes no difference.

People talk of the criminal class as the dangerous class, but there is no man so dangerous to a community as the clever, eloquent Socialist, who, whether inspired by greed, envy, or ambition, goes to and fro upon the earth stirring up hatred and strife between classes, sometimes causing civil wars, and ever ready at a moment's notice to pour out, with fire in his eye and his tongue in his cheek, 'thoughts that breathe and words that burn.' There must be classes in every nation above savagery.

'Conservatism,' says Mr. Mallock, 'means patriotism, loyalty to the Constitution, and loyalty of class to class—of the higher to the lower as much as of the lower to the higher.' French Socialism, or the opposite to Conservatism, of course means the opposite to these things—that is, malignant destruction ; tearing Constitutions up by the roots, with all existing things. The British elector will have to make up his

mind between the two. The Socialist wants destruction — destruction of religion, of the throne, of a second House of Parliament, and of property in all forms, together with repudiation of the national debt. There seems to be no amount of national dishonesty at which the thorough-going French politician in England would stick.

A speech was delivered in 1883 by Mr. Jelly, a Northampton elector, who professed to glory in 'black Radicalism.' The close of the speech, as reported, was as follows :—'I would sweep 'em all away —Church, Queen, nobility, squires, parsons, farmers, publicans, and sinners, and all the riff-raff that follow in their train. *Down with the Church, and up with the Devil!*' We are told that 'this effort of oratory was cheered to the echo by the revolutionary Northampton shoemakers present, who elect to represent them in Parliament Mr. Bradlaugh and Mr. Labouchere.' '*Down with the Church, and up with the Devil!*' is a charmingly pithy and appropriate motto for all such Socialists and Radicals. In other words, down with what Mr. Matthew Arnold calls 'institutions for the advancement of righteousness,' and up with all evil and wickedness. No wonder that Socialism ruins civilised communities. '*Down with churches, kings, queens, law-officers, nobles, gentry, farmers, &c., and up with the Devil!*' All the former to be done away with because they are opposed to the latter. Admirers of the Devil—that is, lovers of evil—are undoubtedly right from their point of view in wishing to do away with all people and things

that are on the side of order and righteousness, and opposed to dishonesty, disorder, revolution, wickedness, and vice.

The two words, 'Communist' and 'Thief,' mean the same, in civilised countries, at the present time. In fact, the Communist himself does not for a moment deny this, only he wants the word thief to be removed from the language of men. Our French Socialists want by universal suffrage to give voting power to all tramps, paupers, and criminal-class people, both convicted and unconvicted. Why? Because they hope, by the assistance of the thieves in the country, to swamp the votes of honest men like you, and in this way bring about that general plundering at which they aim. Have you saved fifty pounds? Then you are a capitalist, and you will assuredly be robbed if our French Socialists get into power. It is believed by some men of science that one reason why tramps, paupers, convicted criminal classes, and the large class between the convicted criminals and respectable working men like you, are dishonest and Socialistic in their ideas, is because they are the descendants of old predatory, low-type, conquered races of men (even sometimes perhaps going back to the Stone Age), who being, like most low-type races, very prolific and tenacious of life, have remained in our towns and form the lowest part of the community. Low-type people are not so much distinguished from high-type ones by want of intelligence as by want of moral qualities. The aim of our French politicians is, as I say, to get voting power put into the hands

of all these people, so that the votes of you, and all respectable working men, may be swamped by them. If you wish for this, I think you will vote for the Liberal candidate. If not, you will surely vote for the Conservative.

Our French Radical politicians want, I say, to give votes to everybody ; to the convicted criminal classes, the unconvicted criminal classes, the semi-criminal classes, tramps, paupers, and those people in our towns who live the lives of savages. The reason they want this is that they believe them to be by nature dishonest and revolutionary Socialists. And they believe right. If you think that such people ought to have power given them to bring about revolution you had better vote for the Liberals.

Do you want your villages to become peopled by disorderly Irishmen, working for low wages because they require no decencies, and are content to live in the same cabin with their pigs? If you do, vote for the Liberal, and you will get them. A proverb says that 'A poor man's house is his castle.' For the Irishman the proverb must be altered to 'A poor man's house is his pigsty.'

In Ireland the Liberal Government has taken the first step in that Socialism which, during the half-barbarous ages of the world, led to such terrible miseries—famines, disease, and wretched poverty. True to their policy they have driven the wage-payers out of that country, so that the wage-receivers, of course, receive so much less wages.

Now, the Irishman of the south and west is a

Roman Catholic Celt, who, as I say, lives a squalid life in the same cabin with his pigs. He, therefore, has so few wants that when he comes to England he can work for less wages than the decent Englishman can. Indeed, it is one aim of the Socialists and Radicals to flood the country districts of England with such people, because they think that the more of them there are, the more votes they themselves will get. And now we come to a disgraceful fact. Mr. Gladstone's Radical Government, in order to get revolutionary votes, has insisted on these low-type Roman Catholic Celts of west and south Ireland having more votes in proportion to their numbers than you have. You, who are law-abiding Englishmen, who never blow up public buildings with dynamite, and who value clean and decent modes of life, are to have your votes drowned by these wretched people; and yet the Liberals, Radicals, and Revolutionists, tell us that you are going to vote for them at the coming election. If that is not a 'Radical thumper,' what is?

Mr. William Glasier writes in the *Nineteenth Century* an article about 'The Dwellings of the Poor.' He says that the greatest difficulty is the Irish population in our towns. 'The Irish are,' he says, 'the terror and perplexity of officers of health.' The condition of their dwellings is unspeakable. . . . No one can form an idea of the disgusting repulsiveness,' &c. &c.

It is no use a landlord giving them decent houses, for they won't be decent. A landlord puts up a

pipe to carry away the sewage. The tenant tears it up and sells it to buy gin. The landlord puts up a rail for his staircase, the tenant pulls it down for firewood. And it is into the hands of these wretched people that our French Radical party want, by universal suffrage, to put the chief political power, thus destroying the power of respectable working men like you.

One reason why nations fall is that voting power gets to those classes who are too ignorant and weak in mind to understand that the State help and Government interference, that weak people always demand, ruin nations by gradually destroying energy and honest independence. But the greatness of a country depends solely on the honesty, energy and independence of the individual people in it. State help and self help are buckets in a well ; when the first goes up the other goes down.

Another thing that destroys countries is the class and party hatred which seem to come at a certain period in the development of nations. But how can a nation stand up against such things? Conceive the different classes in a hive of bees trying to destroy and ruin each other. Of course, such a hive would at once die out, and a swarm more fit to survive would take its place. In fact, the class malignity we see in Radicals is a horrible unnatural growth, and of course, like all unnatural things, must be disastrous in its consequences.

It is a common thing for Socialists to laugh at people who prognosticate a more or less revolutionary

state of things if the suffrage in England becomes too extended. But when we see that a too-extended suffrage has been the cause of about forty revolutions in Spain in as many years, chronic revolution in South American republics, revolutionary doings in Ireland, and periodical revolutions, stagnation of population, deterioration of national character, and conquest by Germans in France, it almost looks as if there may be some grounds for these anticipations.

But Socialists and Radicals are dead to history, to truth, to facts, and to laws of nature. Fuseli, the artist, who painted pictures of an extravagant kind, used to say, ‘D——n Nature, she always puts me out.’ So the Radical always seems to be saying, ‘D——n Truth, it always puts me out.’

Mr. Trevelyan was reported in the papers to have said in January, 1885, that ‘true as it might be that Democracy carried too far brought ruin upon Athens, Rome, and France, we must remember that Englishmen are not Athenians, Romans, or Frenchmen.’ Yes, but what does he mean by Englishmen? Does he mean the enormous and every year increasing quantity of Celts, and aliens of low, conquered races, who are very prolific, who live mostly in our towns, and who, being Celts and low-type people, are Socialists almost to a man?

One sure indication of low type in a race is the disposition to sympathise with crime, and shield the criminal in opposition to the law. A superior race, even at its roughest, always insists on law of some

sort—even Lynch law, where no better is to be had. It will not be necessary to remind the reader where the sympathies of the aboriginal Irish Celt lie.

‘Have you a government in this country?’ asked the Irishman on landing at New York.

‘Of course we have,’ was the answer.

‘Then I’m agen it,’ cried Pat.

Extended power of voting must necessarily bring a country to barbarism when it is in the hands of peoples who are from their nature on the side of criminality and immorality against the law. In France, at the present day, we see every year more and more tolerance for crime. Juries recommend the foulest murderers to be let off on plea of extenuating circumstances. A man was tried for murdering his father and mother. The jury brought a verdict of guilty, but recommended the prisoner to mercy on account of extenuating circumstances. ‘What are they?’ asked the judge. ‘The prisoner is a poor orphan,’ answered the jury. The English and German races are the only races of men who are on the side of morality and law against crime.

Public opinion in West Ireland is on the side of the criminal. The more rent embezzled the more the West Irishman’s conduct is approved of, but if he commit a murder there is no limit to the admiration he excites. ‘In Eastern Africa,’ says Burton, ‘a theft may distinguish a man, but an atrocious murder will make a hero of him.’

Rent embezzlement is simply ‘theft’ in five syllables instead of one.

'Arrah, thin, Pat,' said an Irish wife, 'you'll surely niver pay yer rint while Mr. Parnell's in jail?'

'Bedad, and I won't, Bridget, niver a stiver—and long may he stay there.'

'This,' said the *Spectator* newspaper, 'represents, we believe, with sufficient fidelity, the real character of the patriotism which Mr. Parnell's programme has inspired.'

Now, instead of being better (as Mr. Trevelyan seems to think), these are much worse people than the ancient Greeks and Romans.

Another sign of inferiority of race is want of self-control. In the French Celt this is shown by (to use Mr. M. Arnold's paraphrase) 'worship of the goddess "Lubricity."' In the Irish Celt it is shown by his drunkenness. 'It's drink, sorr,' confessed Paddy, 'that's the curse of ould Ireland. It's the drink that makes a man bate his wife, starve his children, go out to shoot his landlord—and miss him, too, bedad.'

Police statistics tell us that for every Englishman had up for drunkenness, three Irishmen are had up.

'The Celtic races,' says Goldwin Smith, 'have always been remarkable for cruelty and recklessness of human life,' alike in men and women. 'The delirium of bloodthirstiness extended to the Irish women in O'Niel's massacre, and French ladies are recorded to have looked on with horrible pleasure at executions during the civil wars.' These propensities Mr. Goldwin Smith puts down to 'a most wretched kind of *weakness* of character, or what was called in the Latin tongue *impotentia*.' Is there no danger to a

country from giving votes to the enormous and increasing population of these wretched low-type people as Mr. Chamberlain and our French politicians want by completely universal suffrage to do? And remember this, a low-type race, if left unmixed, never becomes a high-type race. Its nature remains the same for ever. The peculiarities of the Celtic people are now exactly the same as the Roman writers described them to have been two thousand years ago. The well-to-do classes in Ireland call themselves Irish, but have little Celtic blood in them.

You have now votes given you. How will you use your votes; for the preserving of things or for their destruction? Upon the answer to this question hangs not only the welfare but the very existence of Great Britain as a civilised country.

All wise men know that any great and sudden extension of the right to vote is 'a leap in the dark.' It is a very serious leap, of which no one can ever foresee the consequences. History tells us it has often led to national ruin. In France, Spain, and the American republics of the Latin and Celtic races, it has, as I have told you, led to endless revolutions and infinite misery. I, myself, wished you to have votes because you are mostly Englishmen and not Celts. Besides, being a Country Bumpkin myself, I naturally wished all country bumpkins to have their opinions represented in Parliament. The town working men had votes given them, so why not you? You are as good as a Cockney Socialist any day, little as he thinks so. I am sadly afraid there are a few drunken

scoundrels amongst you. Every class has its black sheep. But the drunken scoundrels in towns have votes, then what, I asked, had the drunken scoundrel in the country done that he shouldn't have one too? If one is just the other must be just. When we see by history (and we have nothing else to go by) the terrible revolutions and misery that have hitherto come upon countries from a very extended voting power, what reason is there to hope for better things in Great Britain? Well the hope (it is only a hope) is the difference in the circumstances. In the first place, an Englishman is an Englishman, and not a Celt or low-type man. In the second place, Great Britain (unlike the old pagan Greek communities and others that were ruined by democracy carried too far) is a Christian country. On the other hand, our town Radicals and Socialists of the godless French kind (the working partners in the Radical firm) aim at doing away with Christianity. 'Atheism,' says James Hinton, a wise writer, 'is a disease of towns.' Town people never see the works of God, so they don't believe in Him. They see nothing but chimney-pots, brick walls, and shop-windows, which they know to be made by man, so they get to believe there is no other maker of anything. Their minds cannot get behind 'the things that are seen.'

The more extended the suffrage is the better, so long as a country can bear it without life, property, and liberty being rendered unsafe, and thence revolution and misery. But, as Lord Derby truly said, every great extension of the suffrage is 'a leap in

the dark.' The Socialist and Radical want to give votes to paupers, tramps, Irish beggars, criminal classes, and that large class between criminals and respectable working men. The Conservative is opposed to this. You will no doubt vote for the Liberal candidate if you think him right. I think the Conservative right. If a leap in the dark turns out all right, well and good; if it turns out all wrong, it means revolution and starvation to every one of you.

One evil of too extended a suffrage is national extravagance.

'The French Empire,' says M. Schérer, was blamed for extravagance,' but the expenses of the Republic already exceed those of the Empire by one third; and it is increasing every year, though the population of France does not increase. But, perhaps, you think you don't pay rates and taxes enough. If this is so you will doubtless vote for the Liberal.

Foolish people, that is very foolish people, quote the universal suffrage of America to prove its safety. But, in the first place, a new country is no test for an old one, inasmuch as there are infinite backwoods for its scoundrelism to betake itself to, a thinly spread population, and a plentiful food supply. These are great safety-valves against revolutions and lawlessness in a new country. In the second place, within the last twenty years, there *has* been in America about the most frightful revolution and bloody civil war ever known in history; and in the third place Joseph Cook, a well-known American lecturer, says there

will probably some day be a bloody civil war when the necessity comes to limit the suffrage. Besides all this it wants much more than one hundred years' experience to settle a disputed political question. The American civil war of twenty years ago was caused by that national dishonesty which has always been observed when voting power gets more extended than the stage of development of a people will bear. The Northern States wanted, quite rightly, to do away with slavery ; but it wanted, quite wrongly (like all Socialists and Radicals always), to steal the slaves, not buy them honestly as England did in the West Indies, to her enormous pecuniary advantage in the long run, by increasing her credit amongst the nations for honesty. 'Honesty is the best policy.' In other words, 'Righteousness exalteth a nation.' But the Northern States aimed at theft. What was the consequence? A frightfully bloody civil war lasting for years, four or five hundred millions of national debt, and still greater loss than that indirectly. Altogether the United States of America had to pay infinitely more than the price of the slaves would have come to. National unrighteousness and dishonesty must be, and always is, paid for to the uttermost farthing.

There are two great opposition principles in nations, namely, the growing, preserving, creating, and improving principle on the one side, and on the other the disintegrating, deteriorating, and decaying principle. Some men of science think these opposing forces are about equal, producing as they do the

eternal fight between savagery and civilisation. In politics Conservativism and progress in liberty are on the one side, whilst on the other side are Socialism and liberty-destroying Radicalism, or Liberalism as it now is.

The life of nations is a march from the communism in women and property of complete savages up through infinite forms of mixed ownership, Socialisms, and feudalisms, where Governments fix prices and manage the private affairs of people as if they were slaves, till at length we arrive at liberty, and separate, clearly defined ownership of property, with safety to it and to life. Then comes the return journey, back through the Socialistic restrictions of liberty, when life and property again become no longer safe, contracts no longer enforced, and confidence in business transactions destroyed. No one can say exactly when the return journey commences. Herbert Spencer, a great writer, says, that as many nations are always going up as going down. It will depend on the way you use your voting power whether this turn downhill be taken in Great Britain soon or not.

Liberals, French Socialists, and Communists, mean at the present day much the same sort of people in kind, though of course there are degrees.

'What is a Communist? One who hath yearnings
For equal division of unequal earnings;
Idler or bungler, or both, he is willing
To fork out his penny and pocket your shilling.'

Thus wrote Ebenezer Elliot a quarter of a century ago. When once a country begins to legislate in favour

of equality, and therefore against liberty, there is no logical stopping-place short of complete Socialism ; that is to say, the Socialism of the Jew Karl Marx. What business has one man to be richer than another ? Away with property ! What business has one man with a better wife than another ? Away with marriage ! What business has one man with a happy home when another has an unhappy one ? Away with family life ! What business has one man with an acre of land when another has none ? Away with land-laws ! What business has one man with a pig when another man has not got one ? Away with ownership of property !

The Liberal will tell you that he is not a Communist. But this will be only another ' Radical Thumper.' After the Liberal party passing the Irish Land Bill he can never deny that a Liberal at the present day means a Socialist or Communist. His tongue is tied for ever. The Irish Land Bill was simply a return to the Communisms and Socialisms of barbarous ages.

Socialism is founded on class hatred and envy. But the power Socialists exercise comes from the energy that envy and hate give some people, not from their numbers. Man as a rule is not a malignant animal, whatever the ' carping ' Radical and dyspeptic Socialist may think. Man is a generous animal, when his feelings are not led astray by the stump oratory of demagogues.

A Mr. Beezely said a few years ago, I think in the *Fortnightly Review*, ' that society would not long put

up with what he called the insolent display of riches that is made. But the *Times* newspaper, with far more knowledge of human nature, gave the Marquis of Westminster a lecture when he became the Marquis of Westminster, telling him to spend his money right and left with munificence, and that for rich men to spend their money freely was a highly popular proceeding.

Mr. Beezely, I say, was wrong ; man is not an envious animal. The display of riches—that is to say, beautiful pictures, beautiful statues, beautiful gardens, beautiful buildings, beautiful horses, &c., instead of being offensive, is a pleasure to beholders, the only sufferer in the matter being the owner. '*Magna fortuna magna servitus*'—'Great fortune is great servitude.' Still, if this owner is a right-minded man he takes pleasure in giving pleasure, in giving work to thousands, and in adding, as Burke said, to the variety, beauty, poetry, and the happiness of life, as well as increasing, by the wages and salaries he pays, the numbers of well-to-do people in a country compared with the numbers of poor ones.

Socialism and Radicalism, or the Liberalism of the day, aims at theft from capitalists. You have saved a bit of money, bought an acre of land, and let it for two pounds a-year. Then you are a land-owning capitalist, and your property, or the two pounds a-year income from it, is, according to Mr. H. George and the Socialists, to be stolen from you. They do not call it stealing ; they call it 'expropriating without compensation.' But this makes no difference. Calling a

spade 'an agricultural implement' makes no difference. It still is a spade. An educated scoundrel committed a murder ; but he did not call it murder ; he called it 'non-survival of the unfittest.' But this made no difference. A drunken ruffian was had up for wife-beating. The magistrate said, 'I do not know what you call it, but I call it brutal cruelty.' 'Oh,' said the still fuddled beast, 'you call it bru'al croolty, do you ; well, I call it milk yooman kineness : ' but this made no difference.

Socialism means at bottom the same thing everywhere and in all time. It means stealing property from one person and giving it to a number of others. The result is always disastrous. The following case of misery from misplaced wealth occurred in Herefordshire. About eighty years ago a landowner (no doubt a kind-hearted and inconceivably foolish person) left an estate of four thousand pounds a-year to the inhabitants of three villages. Before many years these villages became warrens of pauperism and crime ; and so scandalous did the state of things become that a special Act of Parliament had to be passed to revoke the gift that had caused so much misery.

Socialistic schemes must end in misery and pauperism, human nature being what it is. Political science proves that Socialistic dishonesty, State meddling, and repression of liberty, lead to misery and pauperism. But Socialists hate liberty and honesty, and they love despotic meddling. So they banish political science to the planet Saturn. Political science, like all science, is progressive ; but to banish what has

been learned to the planets, because more may be learned in future, is like leaving a man to die for want of a surgeon because some day surgery may improve.

The essence of French Socialism is, as I say, the envious wish to destroy the capital of capitalists. Have you saved fifty pounds? Then you are a capitalist, and our French Statesmen, if they get into power, will either steal it bodily or tax it heavily, so that it will do you no good; and when you die they will put on a death-tax that will deprive for years those you leave it to of all advantage from it. Of course you will vote for the Radical or Liberal if you like, but I myself believe you to be too sharp to do so.

The Socialist or Liberal sings many songs, but they all have the same chorus, and that chorus is, ‘Ruin the capitalist, ruin the capitalist, ruin the capitalist;’ then everybody will be rich for ever and ever. But to ruin the capitalist, whether his capital is in houses, railways, land, consols, or cotton mills, is to kill the goose that lays you your golden eggs. Every penny of a capitalist’s income goes sooner or later as wages into the pockets of the working man. ‘That wealth,’ says Mr. Mallock, ‘which is envied and accused of causing want amongst thousands is really the cause of the non-starvation of millions.’

‘The only way,’ said Richard Cobden, ‘for the working classes to elevate themselves is by increased temperance, frugality, and economy; and any one who tells the working men of this country that they can be raised in the social scale by any other process than that

of reformation in themselves is interested in either flattering or deceiving them.'

So said Richard Cobden. How about those Socialists who tell the working man that the way to raise themselves in the social scale is to steal (either directly or indirectly by unjust taxation) the wealth of capitalists? I wonder whether R. Cobden was right in saying that such people are merely flattering or deceiving the working men from self-interested motives.

Destroy capital and misery to working men follows as surely as night follows day.

Brewer, the historian, describing the days before capital and capitalists, says: 'Strange and destructive epidemics spread with rapidity entire populations were exposed to periodical famines and starvation, plague and the sweating-sickness decimated the towns,' &c. &c. Starvation, famines, filth, and disease always go together.

These were the days before the great capitalists, whether in land or manufacture, and therefore before the machinery which has put an end in civilised countries to these terrible famines and plagues.

The apparent aim of Mr. Gladstone's dishonest Irish Land Bill and Irish legislation was to drive all capital, all capitalists, and therefore all machinery, out of the country.

Do you know what has come of this Socialism or national dishonesty in Ireland? I will tell you. Land is unsaleable. Ireland is the only country in the inhabited parts of the world where land is unsaleable. But it was certain to become so. Dishonesty

destroys confidence, business comes to a stand-still, enterprise is stopped, money, brains, and energy fly to other countries, leaving ruin, stagnation, and misery behind. Such are, all the world over, the inevitable results of national unrighteousness. Dishonesty and unrighteousness, says science, are condemned by mankind because the experience of ages has proved that they lead to misery exactly in proportion to the dishonesty and unrighteousness. The Christian man agrees with science, but believes in addition that righteousness is eternally and universally good because it accords with divine will and divine nature. The Greeks knew about this inevitable punishment of wickedness two thousand years ago and called it 'Nemesis.' The ancient Hebrews knew about it, and called it 'the wrath of God coming upon the children of disobedience.' All wise men in all time have known and taught it, and now it has become the creed of modern science. Every cause, says science, must have its effect exactly in proportion to the cause. There cannot be unrighteousness without suffering to follow. If the unrighteousness is on a small scale the suffering is on a small scale. If the unrighteousness is on a national scale the suffering must be on a national scale. The laws of nature are absolutely unbending.

The Socialist whose motive force for all his words and actions is envy—what Bacon calls 'the vilest affection and the most depraved; the attribute of the devil': The Socialist, I say, who sticks at no assertion, tells his dupes amongst the working classes that if capitalists, landlords, and rich men were done

away with they would be so much the richer. But facts prove the falsehood of this. Facts prove that in those countries where capitalists, or hirers of the working man's muscles, are richest and most plentiful, the working men who let out to them their muscular strength are best off. Of course common sense says it must be so, but Socialism has none. Without capitalists there is little or no machinery ; now history proves, says Mr. Mulhall, 'that the more machinery supplies the place of manual labour the more we improve the condition of the masses.' That is, that though misery, poverty, and drunkenness, must always exist, the numbers of miserably poor *in proportion* to the number of the well-to-do become smaller as capital and machinery increase, and famines become fewer.

The English are not remarkable for having very logical minds, so some English Socialists have fixed upon land as the only kind of property to steal, whilst some wage war mostly on the manufacturing capitalist. Frenchmen have logical minds, so French Communists advocate all property of every kind being stolen ; separating one kind from another is, of course, only confusion of mind. Attacks on one kind attack all kinds. If a man has saved twenty pounds he is a capitalist, and is as much interested in fighting against the thieving Socialists and Radicals as is a Rothschild with his millions. Indeed, the less a man's capital is the more important it is to him that it should be safe. Thus I think that every man amongst you who is owner of only one pig will vote against the Liberal, and for the Conservative.

G A M E L A W S.

OUR French Socialists and Radical statesmen want to do away with game-laws. What does that mean?

Luckily here again we have France as a warning.

The Socialists say that the public has a right to make any laws it likes. Very good, but it must take the consequences of making them. There is no escaping *them*. They may say that a man has a right to get drunk every day. Very good. But he must take the consequences of doing so. There is no escaping *them*. These are, starving his wife, ruining his children, and dying in a workhouse. In the same way the public may put an end to game-laws. But no public on earth can prevent the consequences of doing so. Let us see what some of these are.

Game-laws and game-preserving, says French democratic envy and hatred, being aristocratic, must be done away with. So everybody shoots what he can, and all birds, great and small, are destroyed throughout the land. Now comes the punishment. 'The trees,' says Dr. Smiles, 'are eaten bare, the vine is destroyed by phylloxeræ, the leaves of shrubs are devoured by caterpillars, which are seen hanging in bunches from the trees, the grub-destroying birds are killed, the crops

are eaten up at the roots, and the national loss is enormous.' Waterton has calculated that a single pair of sparrows destroy as many grubs in one day as would have eaten up an acre of young corn in a week.

Most of you have gardens. Do you want all the produce from them to be eaten up by insects? If you do, I recommend you to vote for the Liberal who wishes to abolish the game-laws. But there would be many other consequences of doing away with game-laws.

How much wages do you suppose comes from sports? Would you be better without these wages for your lads? One goes to be a groom, another a gamekeeper. But if all sports were put an end to your squire would never live at home, and he would want no grooms, or gamekeepers, or gardeners. A great statesman, Mr. Pitt, said he would make killing a fox felony, if it would make country squires live and spend their money on their estates. This was merely his strong way of saying what a good thing he thought those sports which keep country squires and wage-payers at home.

The sour Puritans were the sour Radicals of two or three hundred years ago. 'The Puritans,' says Macaulay, 'condemned bear-baiting, not because they pitied the bears, but because they hated the rich classes of that day, whose amusement bear-baiting was.' This principle is true, yesterday, to-day, and to-morrow. Human nature is for ever the same at bottom.

Illustrations of the national importance of sports and sporting might be given without end. A German military officer wrote an article criticising the campaign in Egypt. He did not think much of the fighting qualities of our enemies, but he says, 'The march of the English cavalry on Cairo and its results will form for all time one of the most splendid feats of war. This march alone saved Cairo from the fate of Alexandria. After the night march of the 12th and the battle of the morning, the cavalry, under Sir Drury Lowe, rode one hundred miles in less than two days. Truly, an achievement that could only be accomplished by troops furnished with English horses, and led by officers every one of whom was a sportsman.' This naturally infuriated the Radical press, and the snarls it brought forth at British sports, such as fox-hunting and racing, were beautiful to read. If the 'sour' and 'carping' Radical was not as ignorant as he always is, he would know that it is English hunting and racing that has produced horses capable of performing such marches (with heavy Englishmen on their backs) as the one that excites the German officer's astonishment; and the consequence is, foreigners come from all parts of the world to buy English horses to improve their breeds.

If there were no game-laws, the trespass-laws would have to be carried out with great severity; and then, if ever you went a yard off a public highway, you would be had up and sent to prison. I think, although the Liberals do laugh at you, as stupid Country Bumpkins, easy to be taken in by their lies,—

I think, I say, that you will here again prove yourselves a little sharper than they expect. The effeminate town Radicals hate and try to put an end to all manly sports and recreations. H. Spencer told the Americans at New York that one great defect in America was the want of these things.

O U R C O L O N I E S.

RADICALS want to cast off the Colonies. Trade with our own colonies is so great, and is increasing so rapidly, that, as a good writer says, if these colonies with India are cast off we shall lose our trade, and our teeming population will starve. If you wish to starve, then, I advise you to vote for the Liberal or Radical candidate. The Conservative aims at preserving our colonies, and forming with them a great confederation of English-speaking people. The Radicals want to cast them off. ‘Perish India!’ was a saying of a well-known Radical. ‘Away with the Colonies!’ say nearly all Socialists and Radicals. If you want England to be a powerful country, able to resist invasion, I think you will vote for the Conservatives.

The following is part of Mr. Howard Vincent’s address to the people of Sheffield :—

‘I trust that the day is not far distant when the entire British Empire, with its eight hundred million square miles of territory, its three hundred million inhabitants, its twelve thousand millions sterling of wealth, its two hundred and sixty millions of yearly public revenue, its eight hundred thousand free soldiers—“circling the earth with one continuous and unbroken strain of the martial airs of England,”

its thirty thousand ships bearing the trade of the world, may be joined together for all time in one Great Imperial Federation. Let all lovers of our common country, whatever station they fill, wherever they be, labour ceaselessly, and to the utmost extent of their influence, to bring about this glorious Union of the whole of the British Possessions in one vast community for the preservation of internal Liberty and the extension of Commerce. The British People, equal then in national privileges, will be all-powerful in their Patriotism.—**GOD SAVE THE QUEEN!**

‘C. E. HOWARD VINCENT.’

The Radicals want to reduce the British Empire to our two little islands, cut off from trade in consequence of protection in all the rest of the world, and therefore so poor as to be helpless whenever any other nation might take it into its head to invade us. Armaments are so costly in these days that every poor country is at the mercy of the rich ones. To make even one large cannon costs, what most people would consider, a very large fortune.

If you want Great Britain to be a helpless little nation, open to invasion at any moment, you had better vote for the Liberal. How would you like your villages to be sacked and plundered by French troops, and you yourselves, your wives and daughters, treated as French troops treat the inhabitants of a town or village they have sacked?

TAXATION.

A WORD about Taxation. The Conservatives think that luxuries, not necessities, ought to be most taxed. The Liberals want to tax necessities most. Silk, wine, and sugar are luxuries. Sugar, indeed, if we are to believe the doctors, is a hurtful luxury. You want bread and meat to eat, not rubbish like sugar. The Liberals object to taxing luxuries, partly from some crazy ideas about Free Trade. When a man has a craze in his head he becomes absolutely heartless. The losses and sufferings of poor men become nothing to him. Everything has to give way to his craze.

MEDDLE AND MUDDLE.

A WORD about the meddling legislation of Radicals and Socialists. There is depression of trade. Do you know why? I will tell you. It is in a very great measure because our French revolutionary party go about threatening every interest in the country, and thus destroying that confidence without which prosperity is impossible. They have in this way driven millions upon millions of pounds out of the country. Landowners have spent vast sums buying land in America, and manufacturers have invested their money abroad. Now, the interest of all this money, had it not been for our French Revolutionists in England, who call themselves Liberals and Radicals, would have gone into your pockets as wages. If you like the depression to continue, and money to leave the country, and never get into your pockets, you had better vote for the Liberals. If not, you will more likely, I think, vote for the Conservatives. All the money of Capitalists goes sooner or later into the pockets of working men as wages, except that of some very few crazy misers who bury their money in the ground.

I will give an instance of loss to you from the Radicalism or Liberalism of the day. Thorne Waste is an enormous tract of country in Yorkshire, nearly as big as half a small county. At the cost of perhaps twenty-five pounds an acre in draining and warping it might be put into cultivation, covered with thriving farms great and small, and happy homes of working men. A few years ago it was proposed to get capital together to do this. The speculation was a good one. Warped land, though very costly to make, is good when made. Then came the revolutionary agitation of the Liberal and town Radicals, or French Socialists, to plunder owners of land. At once all the plans for turning Thorne Waste into farms were dropped, and Thorne Waste will perhaps now never be cultivated as long as the world lasts. Certainly not if the Liberals, town Radicals, and French Socialists, like Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. J. Morley, and Sir Charles Dilke, come into power. I merely tell you about Thorne Waste by way of one example out of innumerable others of the withering effect Radicalism has upon prosperity. Without confidence in the stability and honesty of laws prosperity is impossible.

Socialists are for unceasing Government interference with liberty, too ignorant as they are to know that, historically, meddling legislation always acts differently from, and generally opposite to, what the meddling legislators intend. Very foolish legislation once legislated against high usurious interest. The very foolish legislators little foresaw the fact (as it turned out) that such legislation makes usurious

interest higher than ever. New England liquor laws prohibited the sale of intoxicating drink to all except *bonâ fide* travellers. An intelligent American, being asked what was the effect of these laws, answered that they ‘tended to a considerable deal of *bonâ fide* travelling.’ The foolish legislators had not foreseen that their foolish legislation, besides doing nothing to prevent drunkenness, would end in everybody whenever he was thirsty telling a lie. The fact is, all legislation to make grown men more virtuous by Act of Parliament ends in making them more vicious. Modern English Socialism is a curious mixture of French Revolutionism, peace-at-any-price Quakerism, hatred of manly sports and pastimes, class antipathy, and meddling or paternal and despotic government. Will Englishmen stand these ideas? I say ‘paternal’ government, but it is grand-motherly government. It means Government tying you all to her apron-strings, and not letting you move a finger or think a thought without her leave.

If Socialists succeed in imposing their grandmotherly despotism, vast numbers of manly Englishmen will quit the sinking ship and go to some free country. They will not stay in England and put up with what the *Saturday Review* describes as the probable outlook—‘Taverns, and perhaps theatres, closed, ginger-beer the only drink, and drab the only wear.’ Perhaps the particular shade of drab may be left to each person’s choice, but this cannot be considered certain. It will only be the system of old Peru, where the cut and colour of everybody’s dress

was appointed for him by the Government. ‘In Peru,’ we are told by Mr. Prescott, ‘the people could not even change their dress without a license from their rulers.’ Is this what we are coming to?

It cannot be too often repeated that the aim of our French Socialistic statesmen, who call themselves the heads of the Liberal party, is to drill and organize all Englishmen as if they were Frenchmen, and to destroy that manliness, independence, and self-help, which the great German poet, Goethe, admired so much in Englishmen. Still, if you want to become a Frenchman in leading-strings, you have only to vote for the Liberal, and you will find yourself one before you can look round.

There is no meddling too petty for our contemptible French party. Here is a portion of a letter printed a year or two ago in the *Pall Mall Gazette*:—

‘To the EDITOR of the PALL MALL GAZETTE.

‘SIR,

‘The Lords of the Privy Council have passed a law that all little girls between the ages of three and five attending the elementary schools shall sew their own pinafores. I am the parent of a large family and have little girls of my own. I do not know why the children of the poor should be favoured above the children of the middle classes, and I do hope that the Lords of the Privy Council will pass a law that all little girls alive below the age of five shall sew their own pinafores. While they are about it, could they not make another law that little boys’ trousers shall not wear out in the seat, where they always go first?

‘I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

‘A PARENT.’

I am sure that Mr. Chamberlain, and our French party, will thank me for reprinting this letter. The suggestion it contains cannot but be useful to them.

'The individual liberty,' says Herbert Spencer, 'and independence of Englishmen as distinguished from the subjection to official control of Continental nations, are signs of our more advanced social state.' Thus our French Socialists (the Liberals of the present day) are retrogressionists, who want to bring us back to the Continental condition. The Socialist is simply a despotic tyrant of the old-world kind, though he goes by new names.

Temperance is good, but despotic tyranny is bad. A man is had up by Radical laws before the magistrate. What has he been doing? 'Drinking a glass of beer, your worship,' says the policeman. Then he must be fined ten shillings. But he hasn't got the money. Then he must be sent to prison as if he were a felon. Such is Socialism, or modern Liberalism.

Education is good, but despotic tyranny is bad. A woman is taken before the magistrate. 'What has she done?' 'She kept her eldest girl at home to help her to nurse her little sick sister, instead of sending her to school, your worship,' says the policeman. Then she must be fined ten shillings. But she hasn't got the money. Then she must be sent to prison as if she were a felon. Such is Socialism or modern Liberalism—despotism and tyranny everywhere. I think, my friends, you know better than to vote for a Radical, or Liberal, as he calls himself. I say 'calls

himself,' for, in truth, the Radical or Socialist is the extreme opposite to a Liberal as he used to be, that is a liberty-loving man. The Radical is an intolerant despot. The one aim of our French statesmen, Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke, is to fill the country with meddling and tyrannical state-paid officials, to drill the people, and turn them from free men into slaves.

Mr. Herbert Spencer, the greatest living political writer, calls Socialism 'the coming slavery.' Weak, effeminate, vicious, idle people, are always crying out for Government help.

'Oh!' cries one man, piteously, 'do make a law to prevent any one selling me a glass of gin.' Or, 'Do make a law to permit us to compel ourselves to prohibit us from drinking beer; we do like beer so much, and yet it makes us so very drunk, and is so bad for our health. Oh, do, please, pass a permissive-compulsory-prohibition Bill.'

Another cries out, 'Oh, do make a law that will prevent people finding me out when I tell them lies about the way I have voted at elections. Do, pray, make a law to protect me.'

Another man lifts up his voice, and cries, 'Oh, do make a law to compel railway-carriages, omnibuses, and four-wheel cabs, to carry hot-water bottles for my feet. I have not got a very quick circulation, and my feet do get so dreadfully cold; do, pray, pass a compulsory hot-water-bottle Bill.'

Another poor wretch whines out, 'Oh, do make a law to protect me from catching contagious diseases.

I cannot help going to places where I am likely to catch them ; but, oh dear ! it is such a dreadful thing to catch a contagious disease. Do make a law to protect me.'

All the foolish, weak, cowardly, lazy, vicious people everywhere are always crying out, 'Oh, do make laws to prevent active, industrious, honest, sober people from getting on better than we do ! We do like drinking and idleness so much, and it is so very much trouble looking forward beyond the present moment, and it is so very unpleasant seeing other people better dressed and cleaner than we are ; do make laws that will make everybody as dirty and idle as we are, &c. !' And the aim of the Socialist or Liberal of the day is to make these laws.

If this political party had their way liberty would be at an end, and an Englishman would become a drilled machine, unable to move a step for the points of compulsory enactments bristling on all sides of him. In fact, an Englishman would become a slave.

Besides this, every generation will, according to the law of heredity, become less self-dependent, more drunken, more idle, and more imbecile, till, at length, an Englishman will be as pitiable a creature as the ancient Peruvian was, and from the same causes.

Our leading Radical statesmen, true to these French notions, wish to destroy Christianity with, in fact, all religion of all kinds. Mr. Lecky, a great writer, says, that Christianity alone is the cause why slavery no longer exists in civilised nations. Do you want to return to slavery ? The old English name

for a slave was a serf. Do you want to become serfs again ?

The Radical and Socialist of the present day want to destroy liberty and to meddle unceasingly with every man, woman, and child in the country. Serfs in former feudal or Socialist times could not marry till they had got leave from the governing power. Mr. J. Mill, the Socialist, who lived in France, and from whom modern Socialists and Radicals get their ideas, wanted to compel all Englishmen to remain unmarried till they had saved as much money as Mr. Mill thought enough for a man to marry upon. Do you want to submit to such tyranny as this ? Do you want to go back to these old despotic ways of slavery, serfdom, and Socialism ? Perhaps you do ; then you will, I doubt not, vote for the Liberal or Radical. If not, I think you will vote for the Conservative.

It is so long since slavery existed in Europe that perhaps you can hardly imagine what it means. I will give you a hint or two.

In Rome the slaves were so brutally used that they rose against their masters. But the slaves got the worst of it, and when the insurrection was quelled, six thousand of them were condemned to death and were crucified alive. A slave-owner in Rome could at any time kill or torture his slave whenever he might take a fancy to do so. There were no laws to prevent or punish this crime, and so it was often committed. All the best writers agree that Christianity, and Christianity alone, put an end to this slavery. Still,

if you wish, of course you can vote for the liberty-hating Radical and Socialist.

'Any one,' says H. Spencer, 'who studies in the writings of Taine and De Tocqueville the state of things that preceded the French Revolution, will see that that tremendous catastrophe came about partly from such excessive meddling and regulation of men's actions, and such an enormous drafting away of the products of their actions to maintain the regulating organization, that life was fast becoming impracticable.' In fact, meddling repression of liberty must be disastrous to a nation. Mr. Chamberlain and his party are not highly educated people, so we cannot expect them to know from history the ruin it causes. H. Spencer is more likely to be right in such matters than any other living writer.

You doubtless have heard of the 'Caucus.' It is an organization in Birmingham, supposed to be managed by Jews for the destruction of British liberties. Jews are great Socialists. The leading Socialist writers are the German Jews, Karl Marx and Lassalle, whose aim was to overturn civilised society and bring men back to the old barbarous state of society, when, in consequence of this Socialistic state, terrible famines, diseases, and misery, occurred whenever there were bad seasons.

I think, my friends, although the Radicals always laugh at you as stupid Country Bumpkins, that you are a little too wide awake to elect as rulers of the country Birmingham Jew Revolutionists.

A word about those wonderfully clever, organizing,

money-making, and ever-increasing race of people, our town Jews. Now, it is easy to imagine that many of them may aim at the destruction of liberty, and unceasing meddling on the part of governments, together with the unceasing undertaking by government of the management of everything, from the motive of opening out a field for their own special talents.

A Government interfering everywhere means armies of liberty-destroying officials. It would mean in these days a country being absolutely given over to jobbery, corruption, place-buying and place-selling, on a gigantic scale. Many individual Jews are, of course, excellent men, but there has never been any indication of the Jewish race rising to the English idea of liberty. Of course, the scheme of our Radical politicians for flooding England with despotic officials means unceasing and everlasting rate-paying.

Dickens, in one of his stories, describes a great disturbance in Mrs. Lirriper's lodging-house. A rival lodging-house keeper in the same street accounted for it by saying that Mrs. Lirriper had been 'overcharging to madness.' I think some day there will be riots in England from Socialist governments 'overcharging to madness.'

If rates increase beyond a certain point, production cannot pay, all industries will be given up, wages will cease to be paid because there will be no money to pay them with, and starvation will reign in the land.

Again I ask you, 'Do you want to be governed by a Birmingham Caucus worked by town Jews ? If you do, you had better vote for the Liberal.

'Government by caucus,' says Mr. Hosmer, an excellent American writer, 'will necessarily fall to pieces, because it becomes mere thievery; the government being, in fact, in the hands of an oligarchy of nimble-witted thieves, and the people having little more control over their politics than they have over the choice of the Emperor of China.' No doubt Mr. Hosmer is right. Either government by caucus or the country must fall to pieces.

Working men have not time to read much history, so they often do not know the ruinous results of meddling legislation and destroying liberty and independence as our Socialists and Liberals want to do, and treating people as if they were helpless children.

I will give you one instance. Ancient Peru, in America, was a purely Socialistic country. The people were entirely managed by the Government, which settled for them what dress they were to wear, at what age they were to marry, what wages they were to receive, and what prices they were to pay for things. In fact they were drilled and treated like helpless children, as our Liberals and Socialists at the present day want to drill and treat you. Of course the Peruvians became helpless children, so incapable of doing anything for themselves or defending themselves when invaded, that they were slaughtered like sheep by a mere handful of Spaniards, and thus their nation came to an end.

It was much the same in France.

The power and greatness of a nation depends solely on the independence, power of self-help, and

strength of character of the individual persons who compose the nation. The French lost this strength of character in consequence of Socialistic legislation, so they were helpless like the Peruvians when invaded by the Germans. Do you wish to become a helpless people like the Peruvians? If you do, you will some day be successfully invaded by some strong power as surely as anything on this earth is sure.

I say that Socialism or state help and meddling legislation gradually weakens the character and honest independence of each person who is meddled with. Many years ago the French Government set to work to meddle with everybody's private affairs, to make their wills and destroy their liberty everywhere, in order to bring about that childish dream of the weak Celtic man, whether Frenchman or Irishman, 'equality.' Of course no nation can have both liberty and equality. They necessarily cut each other's throats. Englishmen have hitherto preferred liberty. Hence it is that Englishmen, from their strong independent characters, are spreading themselves over the world, and filling great continents with their race. It is simply because they have hitherto preferred liberty to equality. The only way to bring about equality is by despotic and tyrannical laws, to prevent the intelligent, energetic, honest, sober man owning three pigs, so long as there is some weak or drunken or idle man who can only become owner of one pig. The French Radical and Socialist say these tyrannical laws must be made and carried out. The Englishman, preferring liberty, has hitherto said,

they must not be made in spite of the inequality. You will have to choose at the next election whether you will vote for the English lovers of liberty or for the French liberty-hating Socialist who calls himself a Liberal.

F R E E T R A D E.

A WORD about Free Trade. I will not say much about it, for it is a complicated question that would require a volume to itself. But I will give you one or two instances of confusion of mind.

The Radical or Socialist of the day says Free Trade is right. Now the first principle of Radicalism and Socialism is that right in politics means the opinion of majorities, and that wrong means the opinion of minorities. But the majority of nations say that Free Trade is wrong. Thus we come to two remarkable conclusions of the Radicals, (1) that Free Trade is right, (2) that Free Trade is wrong. And the Radicals are always calling the Conservatives the stupid party!

Here is another instance of confusion of mind. The Radical tells the wage-earner that statesmen should aim at working men getting good wages in England. Again, he says that statesmen should bring about general Free Trade between nations. But Free Trade between nations lowers wages in England. Thus we come to the remarkable statements that politicians should aim, (1) at increasing wages in England, (2) at lowering wages in England.

It is true that Mr. Giffen, whilst not denying that hitherto the cheap labour of foreigners has lowered English wages, says that in future foreign wages will rise to English wages. How is this?

We will suppose two islands, one in a temperate climate, the other in a warm one. The northern island is peopled by men of superior race to the inhabitants of the southern island. In fact, the northerner requires education, clothes, boots, decent dwellings, meat, coals, and other things that are to him necessaries. The inhabitant of the southern island requires none of these things, and yet he is not lazy like many savages, but industrious like Chinamen. The only business of these two islands is to weave cotton goods to supply the world with. Now Mr. Giffen holds that the wages in the southern island will rise to those in the northern island. Other people hold, on the contrary, that they will not rise at all, but that the wages in the northern island will fall. Which is right? I myself believe this statement of Mr. Giffen's to be like the statement we so often hear made quite honestly, but contrary to evidence and to common sense, by some school-boy, solely because he wishes it to be true.

Indeed, the manifest truth is that the high wages in the northern island would never to the end of time do anything towards raising the wages in the southern island, where the inhabitants do not want education, nor decent houses, nor sanitary arrangements, nor places of worship, nor meat, nor boots, nor trousers, nor, in fact, any clothing at all beyond

fig-leaves sewn together, and fig-leaves in a warm climate, where the fig is an indigenous plant, cost absolutely nothing. On the other hand, equally of course, the low wages of the southern island will lower the wages in the northern island, till at last the cotton industry will either be reduced to the smallest dimensions or be totally destroyed. I am giving no opinion about Free Trade being right or wrong, but only an instance of the confusion of mind that we generally find in people whose education has been defective, and always find in people with a bias.

Science does away with time and space. Steam and telegraphs bring distant countries near. Thus, when there is Free Trade a half-naked barbarous person with no wants two thousand miles off competes with you, and lowers your wages just as if he was in England. You are not barbarous persons, so you cannot compete with him. You require clothes, good food, education, and decent surroundings. He does not. One effect of all this is that capitalists take their money, which ought to be spent in wages to you, to other countries, where wages being smaller their profits are larger. For instance, a member of Mr. Gladstone's Government sets up his manufacturing business in Germany, where wages are much less than in England and hours of work much longer. This is only one case out of innumerable ones.

The gentleman I speak of is an enthusiastic Free Trader, but Germany is a Protectionist country. Cute man this. He is what the Bible calls, 'wise in his generation.' He gets his salary as a Free Trade

member of the Liberal Government, and pockets his manufacturing profits too.

More confusion in the matter of Free Trade.

Mr. Gladstone's ministry says that Protection is bad for all countries, under all circumstances. They also say that Reciprocity is only another name for Protection. Then they go and work with all their strength to bring about a reciprocity treaty with France, saying that it will be *good* for the country.

More confusion.

Free Traders say that perfect Free Trade is best for all countries, and that every case of putting a duty on anything whatever causes loss to that country in proportion to the degree. Then they go and put enormous duties upon tobacco, tea, &c. That is, they do what they are unceasingly saying is injurious to a nation. 'England,' says Goldwin Smith, 'while she preaches Free Trade to all the world, is not a Free Trade nation. She raises twenty millions a-year by customs duties which are interferences with freedom of trade, and which are discriminative in favour of goods that are not taxed.' That is, taxes in England are unjust.

Here is the Free Trader's dilemma. If our one-sided Free Trade possesses the virtues its advocates claim for it, we ought at once to abolish all import duties as well as all commercial treaties. But Free Traders oppose abolishing all import duties, and they aim at making commercial treaties. There can be only two alternatives to explain this. One is, that the Free Traders have confused minds ; the other is,

that they lie. There is no third explanation possible to a clear-headed man. My own belief is, that for the most part the former is the true explanation.

More confusion.

Radical Free Traders say that all Free Trade is right. Then Free Trade in labour is right. But Radical trade-unionism is founded on the doctrine that Free Trade in labour is wrong, even amongst Englishmen ; and if an English manufacturer got an army of cheap Chinese labourers over, the Radical Free Trade workmen would break the heads of every one of them. Then Free Trade is not right. Now, what do they mean ? Possibly, in despair of something better to say, we may be told that to bring an inferior race to England, to mix with and deteriorate Englishmen, would be unpatriotic. Yes ; but Free-Trade-cosmopolitan-Radicalism is founded on the doctrine that patriotism is old-fashioned nonsense, that race distinctions are folly, and that all men are equal, and ought to be looked upon as equal ; so if the Free Trader says this, it only means that he is getting more and more confused.

More confusion.

If a Chinaman were to come to England with his cheap labour, the Free Trade working man would at once become a protector of British labour, and, as I say, would break his (the Chinaman's) head, to prevent competition lowering his own wages. But Free Trade makes the competition the same whether a cheap labourer is in England or abroad. Nevertheless, when the cheap foreign labourer goes abroad

again, the English Free Trade working man at once becomes contented again. Surely, this must be confusion of mind. Under Free Trade and rapid water transit, the cheap labourer being in England or abroad does not make any difference. There is the competition in both cases just the same. Competition with foreign cheap workers in silk, wool, &c., lowers the wages of the English workers in silk, wool, just in proportion as the foreign wages are lower than English wages, until, as sometimes happens, the English business is completely ruined.

More confusion.

Lord Derby is supposed to be a clear-headed man. In a speech made at a Cobden Club dinner, July, 1882, he said that the Free Trade question is settled for ever in England, in its favour. But in another part of the same speech, he said that it would be inexpedient to act strictly in accordance with Free Trade doctrines ; we should only practise them so far as it seems expedient to do so. Then the question is *not* settled in favour of Free Trade, but only in favour of more or less Free Trade, according to circumstances. But this is exactly what the Protectionist says.

More confusion.

Some political manufacturing Free Traders say that Free Trade is best for manufacturers as for everybody else, and yet have transferred their own manufacturing works from England to a Protectionist country. Then Free Trade is *not* best for manufacturers. When a man says in words that a thing is most

advantageous, and then does the opposite, it means that the deed tells the truth, and the words—don't.

More confusion.

One of the favourite maxims of Free Trade is that every country should produce those things for which it is most suited by nature. Ireland is a country with a moist, mild climate, and covered a great part of the year with clouds and mists from the Atlantic. This renders it unfit for growing corn. But these same peculiarities of climate are favourable to pasturage, and are the causes of the rich verdure which has given the country the name of 'The Emerald Isle.'

'To be an immense pasture is,' says M. de Lavergne, the excellent French writer, 'the natural destination of Ireland, and the best mode of turning it to account.'

'Ireland,' says Goldwin Smith, 'should be all grazing and dairy farms, to supply the manufacturing population of England.'

Now at the present time, the great effort of Radicals is to destroy, cut up, and have ploughed out, the grass lands in Ireland. Thus we see that our Free Trade Radicals assert, (1) that Ireland should be a country of pasturage because it is most suited for that by nature, (2) that all the pasturage in Ireland should be turned into small arable holdings.

More confusion.

The Radicals say that Free Trade is right, and they laugh at the protecting systems, in old half-barbarous times, of governments settling the prices of

goods, as well as the attempts that have been made at fixing rates of interest to be paid for borrowed money and hired property ; and now the Radicals advocate, and have actually carried out in Ireland, a system by which the Government protects special classes at the expense of others, and fixes the rate of interest at which land is to be borrowed ! The old attempts of governments to regulate prices were given up because they were found to increase the evils they were intended to remedy. Of course, the results in Ireland will prove the same in the long run, unless history is false.

More confusion.

Imposing a duty on necessary food is, says the Radical Free Trader, cruel and wrong. But the Free Trade British Government puts, in India, a duty on salt, which is an absolutely necessary food in that country. Thus it appears, (1) that imposing a duty on necessary food is wrong, (2) that imposing a duty on necessary food is right. Now, what do these people mean ? Perhaps they only mean that India is a long way off, and that cruelty so far off does not matter, especially as the inhabitants have no votes at English elections. But if this is what they mean, why do they not say so ?

Another instance of confusion in the Radical and Free Trade brain. Mr. Chamberlain tells us that he is a Free Trader and a Cobdenite. Now, the first article of belief on which the structure of Free Trade stands, is the axiom that Free Trade is best for all countries under all circumstances. But Mr. Chamber-

lain said in his speech at the Cobden Club in 1883, that he expected, when America took to Free Trade, that English merchants and manufacturers would not be able to stand the competition there would then be with America. Thus it seems, according to Mr. Chamberlain, (1) that Free Trade is best for all countries under all circumstances, (2) that Free Trade is *not* best for all countries under all circumstances. Surely there is confusion of mind here. The only conceivable alternative is that, like Mr. Bright, he loves America more than England, and therefore does what he can to induce her to adopt Free Trade, and thus ruin England. Still, we cannot, in charity, think this of any *high-minded* British Statesman, so we must fall back on the first hypothesis. After all, confusion of mind is not so uncommon, especially in leading party politicians.

More confusion.

Mr. Bright says that Free Trade must be right because trade flourished so much in England for several years after Free Trade was established. Of course it did, for foreign countries had not then learned how to manufacture, so we had it all our own way. We had the start. A few years ago, Mr. Jones, a farmer, made a large yearly income by growing chicory. So all the farmers in the country took to growing it. Then the market being overstocked, Mr. Jones's large income came to an end. And it came to an end because other people had learned to grow chicory too, and for no other reason.

More confusion.

Free Traders argue that Free Trade is right because trade, even since foreign countries have learnt to compete with us, has been advancing, however slowly ; but the real question is, whether trade would not have advanced quicker under Protection. Mr. Gladstone made a speech at Leeds in favour of Free Trade, the chief argument of which was that our exports now exceed what they were in 1840. Therefore, Free Trade is the right thing. He said nothing about the degree trade in *protected* countries had increased since 1840. Mr. Gladstone is like the brilliant farmer who boasted that his pig fed on raw potatoes weighed more than it did when it was six months younger. In fact, it was ten stone. Therefore, nothing was so good for pigs as raw potatoes. He forgot to mention that his neighbour's barley-fed pig of the same age weighed twenty stone.

I am afraid, too, we must also liken poor old shallow J. Bright to this same confused farmer, when he says that Free Trade is right because in Free Trade England wages have risen, seeming to think this an argument, although in Protectionist America wages during the same time have risen still more.

Thus we see that, whether Free Trade is the right thing or the wrong thing, the ideas of Free Traders are nothing but illogicality, confusion, and stupidity.

Free Traders try to settle the question by logic and reasoning, but the logicians disagree amongst themselves. 'The only mode,' says the logician Mill, 'in which a country can save itself from being a loser by the duties imposed by other countries on its commo-

dities is to impose corresponding duties on theirs.' Again he says, 'It may be laid down as a principle that a tax on commodities, when it operates as a tax and not as a prohibition, falls in part upon foreigners.' I wonder whether we can here find an explanation in part of Mr. Bright's denunciations of Protectionists! He has all his life been holding up to worship America and the Americans. Is it possible that his motive for denouncing Protectionists has been fear of their proposed protective taxes falling in part upon his revered friends? It may be so, and if it is so it is very charming to witness such life-long devotion. An idea no doubt prevails that a man's devotion ought to be to his own country instead of to a foreign one. Still patriotism, as the thing was called, is supposed by Radicals to be old-fashioned nonsense. Besides, Mr. Bright is a man of Jewish parentage. Now, Goldwin Smith says that the Jews have no patriotism or love of country, and considering the way they used to be treated in all countries this is perhaps not to be wondered at.

The Jews are influential from their numbers and from their talents for money-making and organizing. They are a cosmopolitan people, who spread themselves over all countries; they dislike working with their hands, and so are more consumers than producers, and they usually have, as Goldwin Smith says, no hereditary patriotism. For these reasons they are generally Free Traders. J. S. Mill seems to have been what in these days is called a 'fair trader.' Still, sometimes he seems a Free Trader. I suppose, being an active-minded man, he got confused. A pig is never con-

fused, for he has only two ideas—boiled potatoes and barley-meal.

England says that Free Trade is right. The rest of the world says that Protection is right. Carlyle tells us of a man who stood on his head in public and then declared that everybody was topsy-turvy. I wonder whether England is standing on her head. ‘He that is giddy,’ says Shakespeare, ‘says the world turns round.’

We all must admire the way Free Trade arose in England. It was done after this wise.

There were certain rich men, makers of woollen, iron, and cotton goods. These men said within themselves, ‘We be rich, but we would fain be more rich. What shall we do that we may become so?’ And they put their heads together. Then arose one among them whose words flowed like the waters of a running river, and said, ‘Friends, listen to the words of my mouth. Behold, we employ much people whose hunger, like the hunger of the voracious cormorant, eateth up our profits. Go therefore to the working man, and say unto him, “If the bread that is eaten by thyself and thy little ones were cheaper than it is the loaves would be bigger loaves than they are, and it would be well with thee and with them.”’ Then there will arise a great cry over all the land for bigger loaves ; and when the bread is made cheaper we will pay lower wages, so that he which hath 200 workmen will gain 600*l.* each year above that which he now getteth, whilst he which employeth 400 men will gain 1200*l.*’ And they did so.

Now, in its way, this bit of sharp practice was

much to be admired. Even the Great Teacher by parables Himself said, ‘And the lord commended the unjust steward because he had done wisely ; for the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light.’ Of course it was not the roguery that he commended, but the sharp-witted activity of mind displayed. Now so far as cunning does show activity it is commendable. This is the moral of the celebrated German story of ‘Reynard the Fox.’ The story is the glorification of sharp-witted and successful cunning. And, undoubtedly, it would not be amiss if the children of light, that is, honest and righteous men, were always as sharp-witted and active-minded as ‘the children of this world’ (as rogues are called in the parable) often show themselves to be.

It may perhaps be said with truth that the wage-receiving workman has on the whole not been better off for bread becoming a little cheaper by Free Trade, for he has lost perhaps far more in wages than he has gained by cheaper bread. But very much money has undoubtedly gone into the pockets of rich town manufacturers from this cause. Some people believe that the working men were simply gulled—made dupes of—turned into cats’ paws, to get the chestnuts for their employers.

Unrighteous deeds never answer in the long run, and now there is a strong suspicion growing up that the rich manufacturers by this dodge really cut their own throats as well as those of other people. At any rate it has impoverished their best customers (as Mr.

Bright now calls them) the British agriculturists, who, at present, in consequence of Free Trade, cannot afford to buy either woollen, cotton, or iron goods, and in fact can only scramble on from hand to mouth without buying anything.

'Free Trade,' says Mr. Hyndman (quoting Mr. H. Fawcett), 'has benefited the poor very little in proportion to the enormous wealth it has given to the rich manufacturers.' Mr. Thorold Rogers, says the same. Again, Mr. Hyndman says, 'If Protection can keep up the wages of working men above the wages they will obtain under Free Trade, then Protection is unquestionably the best policy for the mass of the community.'

That Free Trade has impoverished landowners and farmers, and thence caused loss to agricultural labourers, is denied by no one except Mr. J. Bright, who with the tenacity to an opinion once given, that we see in children and in all half-developed and narrow-minded people, refuses to allow that he has been wrong all his life. Mr. Bright has always said that Free Trade would do no harm to agriculture.

Complete Free Trade means in practice taxing only capital—direct taxation and no indirect taxation. Now a man who receives protection to life and property and the advantages of civilisation without contributing anything towards the expenses of them, is a pauper living on charity. But to be a pauper proverbially destroys character with all that name implies, independence, self-control, self-dependence, energy, &c.

Again, life in civilised countries means work

carried on by capital on one side and labour paid by capital on the other. But if capital is taxed beyond what is just a nation must suffer accordingly, exactly as it must for any other injustice or wickedness.

Do you like parables? If you do here is one for you.

There was once a great and prosperous Empire in Central Asia. For several thousand years its inhabitants were distinguished for courage, energy, independence, honesty, and enterprise; but at length they came under the management of a Grand Vizier, who brought about a complete change in the national character, and thence the gradual downfall of the nation. From a mixture of popularity-hunger, shallow sentimentality, narrow-mindedness, and short-sighted unwisdom, this Grand Vizier, whose powers of persuasion were very great, induced the monarch he served to take off all the taxes from everyone but capitalists, and to extract from them all the money wanted for Imperial purposes. Indeed, this unscrupulous Vizier, regardless of the fact that working men depend for their very existence upon the capitalists, persuaded the Emperor, besides other taxes on capital, to put on enormous succession duties, so that whenever a capitalist died his successor was so impoverished that he had to discharge all his workmen, causing them and their families to die of starvation. This he did to gain popularity amongst the poor working men, who were supposed to be so stupid that they would only be able to see the immediate fact that the capitalists were taxed instead of themselves, but not to have intelligence to understand

the ruinous results to themselves and their country. I say, ‘their country,’ because one result was that capitalists took their capital to other countries where it was not taxed unjustly.

The consequences of this foolish, unjust, and dishonest legislation, were of course disastrous, as all dishonest and unjust legislation must be. All the businesses in the country suffered for want of funds to carry them on ; capital everywhere was crippled or driven to other countries, trade became more and more stagnant, and, worst consequence of all, gradually in the course of years the mass of the population, being unceasingly petted and spoiled and treated as objects of charity by the Government, lost all independent energy and self-control ; the unfittest, instead of the fittest, survived ; they became drunkards ; begot the half-imbecile people drunkards always do beget ; and finally lost all power to compete with working men of other countries ; those who became soldiers were too cowardly to fight ; national disasters followed one upon another ; and at length the nation sank from a first-rate to a sixth-rate power at the mercy of any and every neighbour that might be inclined to make war upon them. Indeed, after a time one of these neighbouring peoples did come, and swept the miserable creatures from off the face of the earth.

Some scientists believe that men have existed on this earth many hundred thousand years, and that the history of nations during that time has been somewhat as follows :—First, savagery ; then gradual civilisation,

with conduct regulated in some measure by religious beliefs of some kind ; then free thinking, but conduct still tolerably decent from centuries of habit ; then pure science, and the worship of mere intellect and physical research without any religious or moral beliefs or habits at all, nor even patriotism ; then utter Atheism and Radicalism ; then immorality and dishonesty without limit, together with loss of capacity for conscientious scruples in even the smallest degree ; then anarchy ; then the gradual return to complete savage life ; then, after hundreds or thousands more years, the commencement of the round again. Thus human life varies enormously.

Here is another parable for you.

Dogmatic Free Traders assert that Free Trade is right under all conceivable circumstances.

A vast number of years ago, in the middle of one of the above cycles, there was, in Central Asia, a thriving country called Cobdenistan. It had only two industries, iron and agriculture. The iron was kept out of all other countries by prohibitive duties, but it had an enormous sale at home amongst the agricultural population. At last there came a time when, from facilities of transport, the iron-manufacturing population could buy all kinds of food slightly cheaper from abroad than from their own countrymen. It was proposed to put a small duty on foreign food, so that the agriculturists might hold their own. But the iron-manufacturing population were narrow-minded people, and, therefore, being jealous of and hating the richer part of the agriculturists, they opposed the

proposition, saying that the richer landowners and farmers alone would profit by the tax, and the poorer farmers and labourers be none the better. Thus nothing was done, and so it came about that rich and poor, farmers and labourers, alike were ruined, and agriculture in Cobdenistan came to an end. But the iron trade was thereby ruined too; for it depended on the agricultural population, there being no market anywhere else. Thus, what had been a prosperous and populous country became an uninhabited desert.

It appears, then, that Free Traders are absolutely wrong when they say that Free Trade is best for a country *whatever* the circumstances may be.

I, myself, have always had faith in Free Trade. But this faith has received some severe shocks. The first came from Mr. J. Bright, when he called Protectionists lunatics and idiots. The American nation (always held up by Mr. Bright as the model nation) is a nation of Protectionists. Then the American nation is a nation of idiots and lunatics! As violence always means weakness, so to ‘call names’ is proverbially a sign of a bad case; but to call one’s dearest friends names looks very bad indeed.

The next shock to my faith came from Mr. Bonamy Price, a good writer, when he allowed that Free Trade must ruin some businesses; and then went on to say that there will always be something that each nation can make cheaper than other nations can, though his grounds for this extraordinary statement he did not give. Suppose, then, that after all her other industries have been ruined by Free Trade, England

should find that she could beat the world in making shoes. In this case Mr. Price seems to look with complacency on England becoming a nation of makers of shoes, but of nothing else. England has a grand past, but this would simplify her future charmingly. England, instead of being a great nation, would become a great shoe-shop, and an 'Englishman' would mean a shoemaker—a poor creature sitting eternally on a bench stitching leather, and full of dyspepsy, gall, communism, and atheism, as the town of Northampton shows us.

Of course a cosmopolitan Free Trader without patriotism does not care what country is great or what country is little; but a man without patriotism is not a man, he is only a fraction of one, and a poor fraction.

Another parable. Free Traders allow that Free Trade must ruin some industries, but they say that every country will excel in something, and out-compete the world in that something.

Thousands of years ago Quakerabia was a powerful manufacturing country in the East. After ages of prosperity a monarch came to the throne who was so enlightened that he forced the nation to adopt Free Trade. Gradually one industry after another was ruined, till at length nothing was left but the manufacture of tom-toms. But here they were without rivals. Nowhere could tom-toms be turned out so cheap and so good, and before many hundred years were over they had a complete monopoly. They supplied the whole tom-tom beating world, and ac-

quired great riches, which riches, exciting the cupidity of other nations, were their ruin. But the Quakerabians had no misgivings. They disliked war from prudential reasons, and the country being surrounded by what they thought impregnable mountains and impassable rivers ('silver streaks' they called them), they worked away at their tom-toms in peace and quietness, till one day a powerful neighbouring people having scaled the impregnable mountains and swum the impassable rivers, came and cut off the heads of every one of them, according to the unalterable custom of those countries in those times. Then they carried off every farthing of money there was in the land. In fact, the Quakerabians were helpless as sheep, for trusting in their 'silver streak' they had no army. Indeed, fighting was against their religious principles, inasmuch as if they kept soldiers they would make so many fewer tom-toms, and therefore do so much less business. Besides, fighting was impossible. Generation after generation of mere industrialism, and nothing but industrialism, had rendered the Quakerabians so effeminate, imbecile, and cowardly, that even the smallest resistance was absolutely out of the question.

And the Free Traders say that complete Free Trade is the best for a country, *whatever* the circumstances of that country may be!!

The Free Traders are exercised in their minds about the depression in trade and agriculture, but nothing will make them confess that Free Trade has anything to do with it. Mr. Bright, after attributing

all the ills of life to wicked Tories, at last seems to have come to the conclusion that the bad times have not come from wicked Tories, but from cloudy skies. But English skies have always been cloudy. A writer in the *Quarterly Review* says that ‘Mr. Bright changes his opinions with a rapidity that almost qualifies him to be a Prime Minister.’ But I think this can be said of Mr. Bright less than of most politicians. He never had many ideas, and what he had were, there is much reason to believe, mostly wrong ones; but right or wrong he has, on the whole, been consistent for a politician. Through all his ignorances, narrowesses, bigotries, illiberalities, loves, and hatreds, he seems to have been honest, really believing his little ideas to comprise the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Now this, in these times of political jugglery, is far from low praise. It is much better to be a foolish and honest man than a clever and dishonest one. I am using the term honest just now only in the sense of consistency to one’s principles. ‘He,’ said J. S. Mill, ‘who only knows one side of a question knows that side wrong.’ This is one reason why Mr. Bright has always known everything wrong. In fact it is why all narrow-minded men always know everything wrong.

The chief cause of agricultural depression is, of course, foreign competition or Free Trade. Supposing one-sided Free Trade to be a mistake, and, instead of beneficial, to be ruinous to a nation, some Free Traders would rather that all their fellow-countrymen should go through the utmost extremity of poverty and

wretchedness, ending in death by famine of the larger part of the population, desolation of the country and its conversion into a barren wilderness, than confess that they have been wrong in their Free Trade doctrines. Such is human nature in its meaner aspects.

Compared with the United States, trade in Canada was (under Free Trade) almost stationary. Four or five years ago she adopted Protection. Since then her progress has been enormous. If the assertion that Free Trade is right is a lie, and acted on, the nation where this lie reigns must go downhill by so much. Every nation is going either up or down. Herbert Spencer thinks as many are always going one way as the other.

What I have said about Free Trade and Protection are only a few hints on a complicated question. As I have said, the subject requires a book to itself; and still, perhaps, nothing would be settled. Indeed, books on the subject have been written and nothing is settled, except that in practice Great Britain adopts a sort of mixed system between Free Trade and Protection, and all the rest of the world adopts Protection. Perhaps nothing but experience will settle it. This experience may require many years, and involve the ruin of a nation or two. A nation sinks, but the world learns. But whatever doubts there may be in this case or in that, one thing is quite certain. When Radicals say, as many do, that complete Free Trade is best for all nations under all circumstances, they show their ideas to be about as clear as those of an Irishman full of whisky.

A word about election cries, for there must, it seems, be election cries. Well, what should they be on the Conservative side? I will give a hint or two. The Socialists, Radicals, and Liberals are reactionaries, or retrogressionists, who aim at renouncing the progress in liberty that has been made in Great Britain, and returning to the old socialisms and feudalisms of barbarous ages ('the coming slavery,' H. Spencer, the great writer, calls it), when prices were settled, and all the private affairs of men managed for them, as if they were slaves, by the governing power. Surely then a good Conservative cry would be, 'Progress for ever, and down with Socialism!' or, 'Liberty for ever, and down with Slavery!' Again, when we consider that the Socialism of the day means more or less expropriation without compensation, or, in plain English, 'theft,' I think a good election cry would be, 'Thou shalt not steal.' Again, Socialism means revolution and destruction of all existing things. Surely then a good cry would be, 'Down with Socialists, Communists, and Dynamite Devils!'

THE END.

LONDON:
Printed by STRANGEWAYS & SONS, Tower Street, Upper St. Martin's Lane.

